Finally, Mr. Chairman, there is another question raised by Mr. Kern's appointment which disturbs me greatly. Let us assume, for the moment, that Mr. Kern would turn out to be a vigilant advocate of the liberal viewpoint on the Federal Trade Commission. There is still a hitch. About a year ago, Chairman Howrey promoted Mr. Kern to be Deputy Director of the Bureau of Litigation of the Federal Trade Commission.

In that position, Mr. Kern's duties included the prosecution or supervision of the prosecution of many cases initiated by the Federal Trade Commission under its basic statutes. I have been advised by competent legal counsel—as I said, I am not a lawyer—that under section 5–C of the Administrative Procedures Act, Mr. Kern would be disqualified from participating as a member of the Commission in the consideration of cases with which he had a connection as Deputy Director of the Bureau of Litigation during the past year. Actually, I am informed all litigated cases before the Federal Trade Commission during the past year came under Mr. Kern's purview.

If my information and legal advice are correct, Mr. Kern will be disqualified from participating at all—for some years to come—on many, if not most, of the cases coming before the Federal Trade Commission.

The Federal Trade Commission already has a chairman, Mr. Howrey, who I understand has disqualified himself from sitting on many of the cases because, as a private attorney, he appeared before the Federal Trade Commission in behalf of many of the business interests which are currently involved in FTC proceedings.

Now here it is proposed to appoint another member of the Federal Trade Commission who will likewise be disqualified from participating in the decisions of the Commission. We would have, as a result, in most cases a three-member Commission.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, I am not an expert on these matters. I am not qualified to give expert testimony. I am merely repeating what I have been told. Therefore, I would strongly suggest and urge that this committee hear Mr. Stephen Spingarn, a former member of the Commission, and a qualified and expert attorney-at-law. I urge you, Mr. Chairman, to call Mr. Spingarn to testify on this point before this committee.

Mr. Chairman, this is the sum total of my testimony. I have come here before you because I feel strongly that it will be most unwise to approve Mr. Kern's nomination, and that President Eisenhower, on the basis of the record of these hearings, should be given a chance to reconsider his decision in replacing Mr. Mead.

I hope he will continue to avail himself of the services of Mr. Kern in his present position, and will send to the Senate for reappointment, the name of James M. Mead, of Buffalo.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 20, 1955

The Reverend George A. Taylor, rector, St. David's Episcopal Church, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious God, we humbly beseech Thee, as for the people of these United States in general, so especially for their Senate and Representatives in Congress assembled, that Thou wouldst be pleased to direct and prosper all their consultations, to the advancement of Thy glory, the good of Thy church, the safety, honor, and welfare of Thy people; that all things may be so ordered and settled by their endeavors, upon the best and surest foundations, that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us for all generations. These and all other necessaries, for them, for us, and Thy whole church, we humbly beg in the name and mediation of Jesus Christ, our most blessed Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 17, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

On June 13, 1955:

S. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 winter Olympic games at Squaw Valley, Calif.

On June 15, 1955:

S. 153. An act to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; and

S. 414. An act to authorize an examination and survey of the coastal and tidal areas of the Eastern and Southern United States, with particular reference to areas where severe damages have occurred from hurricane winds and tides.

On June 16, 1955:

S. 39. An act for the relief of Stanislavas Racinskas (Stacys Racinskas);

S. 68. An act for the relief of Evantiyi Yorgiyadis;

S. 93. An act for the relief of Ahti Johannes Ruuskanen;

S. 121. An act for the relief of Sultana Coka Pavlovitch;

S. 129. An act for the relief of Miroslav Slovak;

S. 193. An act for the relief of Louise Russu Sozanski;

S. 236. An act for the relief of Johanna Schmid;

S. 265. An act to amend the acts authorizing agricultural entries under the nonmineral land laws of certain mineral lands in order to increase the limitation with respect to desert entries made under such acts to 320 acres;

S. 266. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to transfer certain property of the United States Government (in the Wyoming National Guard Camp Guernsey target and maneuver area, Platte County, Wyo.) to the State of Wyoming;

S. 320. An act for the relief of Mrs. Diana Cohen and Jacqueline Patricia Cohen;

S. 321. An act for the relief of Anni Marjatta Makela and son, Markku Paivio Makela;

S. 351. An act for the relief of Ellen Henriette Buch;

S. 407. An act for the relief of Helen Zafred Urbanic;

S. 439. An act for the relief of Lucy Personius;

S. 504. An act for the relief of Priska Anne Kary;

S. 528. An act to revive and reenact the act authorizing the village of Baudette, State of Minnesota, its public successors or public assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rainy River, at or near Baudette, Minn., approved December 21, 1950;

S. 755. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain war housing projects to the city of Warwick, Va., and the city of Hampton, Va.;

S. 844. An act for the relief of Zev Cohen (Zev Machtani);

S. 998. An act to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Oklahoma to the city of Woodward, Okla.;

S. 1398. An act to strengthen the investigation provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act; and

S. J. Res. 6. Joint resolution to provide for investigating the feasibility of establishing a coordinated local, State, and Federal program in the city of Boston, Mass., and general vicinity thereof, for the purpose of preserving the historic properties, objects, and buildings in that area.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HUMPHREY was granted leave of absence for this week while in attendance on the United Nations anniversary celebration in San Francisco, as a representative of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MILLIKIN was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to sit and receive testimony during the session of the Senate this afternoon. The subcommittee is receiving testimony on the question of extending the Defense Production Act, which expires on June 30.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there will be a morning hour for

the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection therewith be subject to the usual 2-minute limitation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON FOOD AND CLOTHING

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission's Task Force on Food and Clothing, dated April 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON LENDING AGENCIES

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission's Task Force on Lending Agencies, dated February 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission on Budget and Accounting, dated June 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission's Subcommittee on Transportation, dated March 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission's Subcommittee on Research Activities, dated April 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON LEGAL SERVICES AND PROCEDURE

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission's Task Force on Legal Services and Procedure, dated March 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON SURPLUS PROPERTY

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on that Commission's Task Force on Surplus Property, dated February 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON GENERAL SUPPLY FUND, GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the General Supply Fund, General Services Administration, for the period July 1, 1949, through June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 38

"Joint resolution relative to H. R. 4927, amending the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to certain Mexican aliens

"Whereas there is no provision in Public Law 414, commonly known as the McCarran-Walter Act, to adjust status for Mexican aliens (citizens of contiguous countries) where the deportation or refusal to grant reentry will cause, or has caused, extreme family hardship to American citizen spouses or children; and

"Whereas it does not appear that it was the intention of the authors or those who supported enactment of this law to cause separation of families and the banishment forever of a parent to Mexico, simply because in the desperate effort of these men to better their environment, they crossed our border without color of right; and

"Whereas in many instances in the past individuals have walked across our unguarded southern border, entering the United States illegally in violation of the United States immigration laws; and

"Whereas the entry of such persons may have occurred many years prior to their banishment or deportation from this country, and after they had become the parents of families, and had become taxpayers and respected residents of our country; and

"Whereas separation of mother or father from their children results in great moral, physical, and financial hardship on such persons, leading to juvenile delinquency and disruption of our community life; and

"Whereas in addition to the moral hardship caused by the separation of families, this law imposes a serious financial burden upon the taxpayers of this State, in that there are many hundreds of such families compelled to seek social aid and public assistance at a high cost to the taxpayers; and

"Whereas many of our most respected citizens are of Mexican ancestry and our Nation has great ties of friendship with our southern neighbor and friend, who has served with us in the struggle of freedom and democracy in our turbulent world; and

"Whereas there is pending before Congress legislation, H. R. 4927, which would amend the immigration laws to provide relief from the hardship in such cases, while still imposing adequate safeguards to discourage illegal entrance: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 4927; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 39

"Joint resolution relative to providing Santa Clara, Alameda, San Benito, Contra Costa, and Santa Cruz Counties with a supply of water from the Central Valley project

"Whereas Santa Clara, Alameda, San Benito, Contra Costa, and Santa Cruz Counties comprise one of the fastest growing regions of the State of California; and

"Whereas a great increase in population and in industrial development, together with intense agricultural activity, have combined to tax severely the existing water supplies of the region; and

"Whereas at present the watersheds of Santa Clara, Alameda, San Benito, Contra Costa, and Santa Cruz Counties are virtually the sole source of the water supply for the region; and

"Whereas to meet the desperate water needs of this region, it is necessary that an additional supply of water be provided with the least possible delay: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior to take such action through the Bureau of Reclamation as may be necessary to conduct and complete with the least possible delay the necessary investigations, surveys, and studies for the purpose of providing plans and feasibility reports to furnish a supply of water from the Central Valley project to Santa Clara, San Benito, Alameda, Contra Costa, and Santa Cruz Counties, all generally in keeping with section 2 of the act of October 14, 1949 (63 Stat. 852), authorizing the American River Division, Central Valley project; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the United States Bureau of Reclamation."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 40

"Joint resolution relative to saline water conversion

"Whereas the United States Department of the Interior proposes to engage in a saline water conversion program; and

"Whereas in order fully to carry out the saline water conversion program, it is necessary that a research activity be undertaken; and

"Whereas because of the critical nature of the water problems of the city of San Diego, that city would appear to provide an appropriate location for the saline water conversion program research activity in addition to the other locations in California where such research is now being conducted: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and Congress of the United States to consider locating some of the research activity of the saline water-conversion program of the United States Department of the Interior at San Diego, Calif.; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the United States Secretary of the Interior."

A resolution of the Assembly of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Resolution 277

"Resolution relative to location of the aircraft industry in California and the Western States

"Whereas recent public statements made by officers in high position in the United States Air Force have caused the belief among many persons in California that the United States, for strategic purposes, prefers the location of the major aircraft industries of this country in places other than California and the Western States; and

"Whereas it appears that such a preference for relocation of the aircraft industry may result in the placing of Federal Government contracts for aircraft in such manner as to affect adversely the economy of the aircraft industry of the Western States, and particularly in California; and

"Whereas the aircraft industry of California and the Western States has for varied reasons grown to major proportions in these localities and has become of prime importance in local economies, such that relocation of this industry in whole or in part would adversely affect the economy of entire communities; and

"Whereas loss of any large portion of the aircraft industry to the Western States would create unemployment and other suffering which might amount to such scope as to be of national concern: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Assembly of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress to study and investigate thoroughly any policy or policies proposed on behalf of the Federal Government and its agencies with regard to the aircraft industries of California and the Western States, to take immediate action calling for the study of any question raised regarding the strategic location of the aircraft industry in California and the Western States, so that any decisions upon such policy changes by the Federal Government will be resolved only after a full hearing before the Congress of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A copy of page 5888 of the Journal of the Assembly of the State of California, of June 8, 1955, showing a motion which was carried relative to the Trinity-San Luis project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"MOTION TO MEMORIALIZE CONGRESS

"Mr. Dolwig moved that the Assembly of the State of California respectfully memorialize the Congress and the President of the United States to enact such legislation as may be required to bring about the immediate authorization and construction of the Trinity-San Luis project and that in such authorization the Congress make provisions mutually satisfactory to the United States and the State of California for the integration of the San Luis project with the California State water plan; and further

"That the chief clerk of the assembly transmit copies of this motion to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Secretary of the Army."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint Resolution 56

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to waive certain restrictions with respect to exchanges of public lands for emergency relief to distressed persons in Puna, T. H.

"Whereas recent volcanic activity in the district of Puna, county of Hawaii, T. H., has desolated many acres of heretofore productive farmlands; and

"Whereas unlike other catastrophic events which befall lands and render them only temporarily unproductive, lands inundated by flowing lava are rendered totally worthless for thousands of years; and

"Whereas there is little or no privately owned land in or about the district of Puna, T. H., available for purchase by those persons whose lands have been so destroyed; and

"Whereas there are substantial acreages of public lands within and adjacent to the said district of Puna, T. H., which can be made available to those persons whose lands were destroyed by such volcanic activity and to persons who had existing leases of such lands: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to enact suitable legislation which would, notwithstanding any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act, authorize and direct the commissioner of public lands to sell, to persons whose lands were destroyed by lava flows and to persons who had such lands under lease, public lands within or adjacent to the district of Puna, county of Hawaii, T. H., the area of such land to be purchased by any one person, not to exceed 80 acres or the area of land destroyed, whichever is the smaller, each such sale to be at a price determined by the board of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii to be the reasonable value thereof.

"SEC. 2. Duly authenticated copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 15th day of June A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

Two acts (Nos. 249 and 254) of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; relating to the issuance of $50 million in highway revenue bonds; and to create the Hawaii Development Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu, T. H., relating to the reapportionment of the Territorial legislature; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A petition signed by Stanley L. Shoemaker, and sundry other members of American Legion Post, No. 636, Boron, Calif., relating to world citizenship; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTIONS OF MIDWEST STATES CONFERENCE OF MACHINISTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a series of four resolutions adopted by the Midwest Conference of Machinists, at their fourth annual conference held in Wichita, Kans., on May 21 and 22, 1955.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTION NO. 1—SUBMITTED BY THE WISCONSIN STATE CONFERENCE OF MACHINISTS

"Whereas the rapid changes which are being made in methods of production demonstrate conclusively the accelerating tempo of change in all of our economic and social life; and

"Whereas the technological progress has now brought forth the newer techniques called automation, which brings with it the problems of importance to the working force of our Nation; and

"Whereas the age limits imposed on workers in industry are being constantly lowered by management to meet the requirements of the modern pace of production; and

"Whereas the swift changes in our economic and social life present growing threats to the sense of security and well-being of our wage earners; and

"Whereas the possibilities of automation should not be permitted to operate to the detriment of society, but should be applied to create a fuller and more secure life for all of our citizens, especially to those no longer able to withstand the pace of modern production due to age; and

"Whereas there has been no progress in the lowering of the age of eligibility for social-security benefits to keep pace with the changed conditions which increasingly face our older workers since the enactment of the social-security law more than 20 years ago: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Midwest States Conference of Machinists in conference assembled in the city of Wichita, Kans., on this 22d day of May 1955, go on record in favor of a reduction in the eligibility age for benefits under the Social Security Act to 60 years; and be it

"Resolved, That the Midwest States Conference of Machinists submit this resolution to the next conventions of the American Federation of Labor of the nine-State area for their concurrence and promotion; and be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this conference and that copies of this resolution be sent to all congressional representatives of the nine-State area comprising the Midwest States Conference of Machinists."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"RESOLUTION NO. 6—SUBMITTED BY THE WISCONSIN STATE CONFERENCE OF MACHINISTS

"Whereas it has come to our attention that field offices of the Bureau of Apprenticeship, United States Department of Labor, located in the nine States area of the Midwest Conference of Machinists have been closed because of curtailment of funds; and

"Whereas the training of tradesmen is absolutely essential to the national health and welfare; and

"Whereas history shows that governmental assistance is needed in the promotion of on-the-job training for the youth of our land as part of the civilian-defense program which sustains the front line of defense; and

"Whereas the curtailment of promotional efforts to train young men as tradesmen in the metal and manufacturing firms will seriously jeopardize our position in national and international prestige: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Midwest States Conference of Machinists, assembled in convention in the city of Wichita, Kans., on May 22, 1955, go on record as vigorously opposing any

reduction in the personnel of the Bureau of Apprenticeship, United States Department of Labor; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That every effort be made to reestablish those offices already closed in this nine States area; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to all United States Senators and Representatives of the nine States area; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of Labor, United States Department of Labor, William F. Patterson, Director of Bureau of Apprenticeship, United States Department of Labor and to Brother Al Hayes, president, International Association of Machinists."

To the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

"RESOLUTION NO. 13—SUBMITTED BY LOCAL NO. 612, LINCOLN, NEBR.

"Whereas the objectionable Dixon-Yates contract is a real threat to the lower power rates that the public have enjoyed since TVA came into existence; and

"Whereas this is very emphatically proven by the fact that the power rates increase with distance as one travels away from the Tennessee Valley regardless of whether power is supplied by private or public utilities; and

"Whereas the said Dixon-Yates contract was rushed into existence under the most unnecessary noncompetitive conditions, expertly designed to use public tax moneys to furnish private power interests a risk-free project that will drive a wedge into the TVA yardstick of low rates: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Midwest States Conference of Machinists in conference assembled in the city of Wichita, Kans., this 22d day of May 1955, resolve that the said Dixon-Yates contract be condemned and withdrawn because of the damaging effect it will have on the public interests and power rates; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the proper congressional committee and all Members of Congress from our nine States area."

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"RESOLUTION NO. 20—SUBMITTED BY THE FARM COMMITTEE OF FOND DU LAC COUNTY, WIS., AND REWRITTEN BY THE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE MIDWEST STATES CONFERENCE

"Whereas members of the International Association of Machinists are interested in all actions which will produce a stable, healthy and expanding economy; and

"Whereas the financial and economic plight of the farmer is of importance to the wage earner because the farmer represents one of the greatest markets for the goods and machinery we produce; and

"Whereas the city workers are conversely one of the greatest markets for the foodstuff and other products that the farmer produces, our interests are interrelated and our well-being is indivisible: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Midwest States Conference of Machinists go on record this 22d day of May 1955, in conference at Wichita, Kans., to take cognizance of the steadily decreasing farm income which has been evident since 1952 and that we go on record to urge the Congress of the United States to enact farm legislation which will be fair and equitable to the small family-type farmer and which will guarantee the farmer an equitable return through reasonable income supports; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be distributed to all Congressmen and Senators from the nine States area with the request that they support such legislation on the floor of Congress; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to our international headquarters for such followup by the legislative department of the International Association of Machinists as may be necessary."

POSTAL RATES APPLICABLE TO RELIEF GOODS—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Presbytery of the Great Plains of the Bible Presbyterian Church, sent to me by Rev. Lloyd C. Snyder, of Lemmon, N. Dak., relating to postal rates applicable to relief goods sent abroad.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RE POSTAL RATES—SENDING OF RELIEF GOODS

"Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

"Whereas the need for used clothing and bedding, etc., in the lands of Korea and Palestine, and many other places in the world, is so great; and

"Whereas the present postal rates are so excessive that it makes it prohibitive for individuals and our small churches to send such clothing and bedding, etc., to aid in the supplying of the need: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the members of the Presbytery of the Great Plains of the Bible Presbyterian Church do hereby request our Representatives in Congress to put forth every effort to have domestic and foreign postal rates lowered for the purpose of sending such relief goods, and that the sending of such relief goods through APO be resumed."

The stated clerk of the presbytery was directed to send a copy of this resolution to each of our Representatives in the Congress from both North and South Dakota.

Your consideration is very much appreciated.

Rev. LLOYD C. SNYDER.
LEMMON, S. DAK.

REORGANIZATION OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a letter I received from Charles W. Ellis, manager of the Clay and Washington County Rural Electric Cooperative Association, together with a resolution adopted at their meeting, regarding the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, providing for the reorganization of the REA. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE C. & W. RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Clay Center, Kans., June 10, 1955.

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CARLSON: At the 17th annual meeting of the C. & W. Rural Electric Cooperative Association, held at the city hall in Clay Center on May 11, 1955, the enclosed resolution was unanimously approved by the members in attendance. The resolution was offered by Mr. Ernest Benne, of Washington, Kans., and seconded by Mr. William Steffen, of Wakefield, Kans., both members in good standing of the cooperative.

During the discussion prior to the voting on this resolution, Mr. Benne stressed the fact that the resolution was of his own offering and that neither the board of trustees nor the management were aware of his intention to offer the resolution prior to the time of the meeting. We mention this to indicate the grassroots nature of the action and wish to assure you that the 415 members registered at the meeting voted without exception and with considerable enthusiasm for the resolution.

We believe you will be interested in having this information since it very clearly indicates the position of the farm people in Kansas on REA.

Thank you for your attention.

Yours very truly,

CHARLES W. ELLIS,
Manager.

Whereas bills embracing the recommendations of the Hoover Commission are now pending in the United States Congress providing for the reorganization of REA which would change entirely the present methods of administering and financing the local electric cooperatives; requiring them to secure their loans for operation and construction from private sources instead of from funds provided by the Federal Government as at present; and

Whereas such financing would necessitate a substantial increase in rates to pay the greatly increased rate of interest, making it impossible for many farmers, all of whom have suffered a major decline in income, to continue using electric service. Adoption of these recommendations by Congress would be so detrimental to our rural electric cooperatives that most of them would be ruined. The financing of REA has not been a liability, or loss, to the Federal Government. Practically all of the local associations are in sound financial condition. Some associations have already paid off their obligation to the Federal Government 14 years ahead of schedule: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Clay and Washington Electric Cooperative in meeting assembled at Clay Center, Kans., That we do emphatically oppose the adoption of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission or any law that will materially change the present REA setup. Instead that more money be made available for the expansion and improvement of established systems and also for the building or acquisition of generating facilities in areas where sufficient wholesale power is not now being generated. Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator Andrew Schoeppel, Senator Frank Carlson, Representative William Avery, Ancher Nelsen, REA Administrator, and to other persons whom the board of trustees might feel should know of this action. Also that a copy be sent to the Kansas Electric Farmer and to other publications, working in the interest of farmers, which the board of trustees may select, also that a copy be made a part of the minutes of this meeting.

CONSTRUCTION OF LARGER DETENTION DAMS UNDER WATER FACILITIES AND SOIL CONSERVATION PROGRAMS—LETTER AND RESOLUTIONS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a letter I received from O. W. Lyman, president of the Kansas Watersheds Association, together with resolutions of this organization, in regard to a Federal contribution for the construction of the larger-size detention dams now being constructed

under our water facilities and soil conservation programs.

In Kansas, we have in progress the construction of detention dams, ponds, and terraces on a number of small watersheds in different sections of the State. This program is well received, and is important for the control of water runoff at its source.

Many of the larger detention dams are of such size that the individual farmer or rancher is unable to finance their construction.

It is for these reasons that I urge the Senate to give consideration to the suggestion made by the Kansas Watersheds Association.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter and resolutions printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS WATERSHEDS ASSOCIATION,
Burdett, Kans., June 11, 1955.

Senator FRANK CARLSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: Enclosed are copies of resolutions adopted by the Kansas Livestock Association and the Kansas Watersheds Association. You have previously received a copy of the resolutions from the KLA.

The resolutions set out the policy and stand of these associations regarding watershed and main-stream dams. We are opposed to the construction of the large flood-control structures until the completion of a thorough program of construction of detention dams at the points of rainfall.

If the United States Government is going to pay 100 percent for the construction of large dams and also for the dam sites and easements, then the same formula should be applied to the smaller detention dams. Due to the loss of agricultural income, a great percent of our farmers cannot finance the 50 percent of the construction of these detention dams. Why should one be required to finance out of his own pocket 50 percent of the small structure while he is called on to pay his share of the taxes for construction of the large dams? We are sure you will not argue with us as to the importance and value of these small watershed structures as means of flood control and water storage. They will recharge our underflow much more rapidly than the large dams, and at points where the large dams will be of no value for recharging of our aqueous beds.

Will be pleased to receive your reaction to these resolutions.

Sincerely,

O. W. LYNAM.

RESOLUTION OF KANSAS WATERSHEDS ASSOCIATION

The board of directors of Kansas Watersheds Association, meeting May 26, 1955, in Topeka recommends:

(a) Integration of national (including interagency planning), State and local water conservation policy, planning and execution on a working, practical basis, to the end that such projects get underway with minimum red tape and delay;

(b) Cost participation by the United States, the States and their political subdivisions, and other (private) beneficiaries approximately proportionate to their respective benefits, and the application of this formula to all public dams and other watershed, irrigation and flood-control works (as now required in the case of projects under the jurisdiction of the USDA); and

(c) Construction of detention dams and "on the land" structure in the watershed, to increase soil infiltration, raise the water table, provide local water supply and minimize silting, should be thoroughly completed before the introduction of reasons for the construction of "main stem" dams. Water storage in Kansas for navigation and hydroelectric purposes is not economically feasible; obviously there is more flood hazard than flood control in such water storage.

O. W. LYNAM, *President.*

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION POLICY

The following report of the soil and water conservation committee of the Kansas Livestock Association was adopted as the policy of the association in general assembly. It was presented by Wm. Ljungdahl, Menlo, chairman:

"It recognizes that the seriousness of both soil and water conservation should command the attention of our people in all parts of the State in general, and in certain localities specific consideration to the problem of flood control.

"In an approach to dealing with problems of flood control which are applicable in all parts of the State, we have the State watershed district law which was enacted 2 years ago and which has for its purpose to delay the runoff of water, during heavy rains, and afford control over such runoff, to the end that it will serve the land on which it falls by way of beneficial saturation, instead of losing the water together with destructive soil erosion.

"Since its enactment by the State legislature, the Congress of the United States has passed a watershed law of its own which is designed to implement watershed operations in cooperation with the several States.

"If changes are needed in our present State watershed law, in order to bring it into conformity with the Federal law, this association urges that the present session of the legislature pass the necessary amendments for such purposes.

"Your committee suggests that we approve a control program for the water runoff of our State, and with that the benefits that would be provided by having an adequate water supply over an entire watershed area, rather than providing a concentrated supply of water to a limited area, as would be the case if only large downstream reservoirs were provided.

"It has been stated to your committee, on good authority and we believe the statement is correct, that in the construction of large dams that the entire cost is borne by the Federal Government.

"This is in contrast to the policy adopted by the Federal Government in regard to small dams.

"The Kansas Livestock Association recommended that in the construction of all dams that the Federal Government's participation in the matter of cost be in the same proportion to the total cost.

"This association heartily endorses soil conservation practices applicable to and best serving the different areas of our State, and thus preserving our greatest asset, the productive topsoil of Kansas.

"The Kansas Livestock Association disapproves the construction of large downstream reservoirs such as the Tuttle Creek Dam until after all efforts to control runoff water where it falls have been exhausted.

"And it is the further recommendation of the Kansas Livestock Association that Congress be petitioned to establish a national water resources development policy; provide for integrated planning of a watershed or basin area by committees of people of the area, to be developed within the area and to provide for the impartial review by a national review commission as to the feasibility, the economic justification and priority of such projects, and to recommend to the Congress of the United States the basis for such authorization and appropriation to the various agencies which may engage in water resources programs.

"SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION COMMITTEE OF THE KANSAS LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,

"WM. LJUNGDAHL,
"Menlo, Chairman,

"J. J. MOXLEY,
"Council Grove, Vice Chairman,

"W. I. BOONE,
"Eureka,

"TAYLOR L. JONES,
"Holcomb,

"GEORGE HILL,
"Buffalo,

"STANLEY MARR,
"Esbon,

"FRED GERMANN,
"Manhattan."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 4904. A bill to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years; with amendments (Rept. No. 582).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations:

S. 1585. A bill to provide for the return to the town of Hartford, Vt., of certain land which was donated by such town to the United States as a site for a veterans hospital and which is no longer needed for such purpose; without amendment (Rept. No. 583).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the nomination of Lt. Gen. Isaac Davis White, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of general, under subsection (b) of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, and ask that this nomination be placed on the Executive Calendar. General White will be assigned as Commanding General, Army Forces Far East and Eighth Army.

I also report the nomination of Francis Leonard Castillo, United States Naval Academy, class of 1955, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, and ask that this also be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, also from the Committee on Armed Services, as in executive session, I report the nominations of approximately 1,900 names for temporary and permanent appointment in the Navy and Marine Corps in grades from ensign to lieutenant. All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar of this list, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Mississippi.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation five lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2271. A bill for the relief of Salomon Benveniste; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 2272. A bill for the relief of Evangelos Demetre Kargiotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 2273. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Barron-Aragon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 2274. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2275. A bill for the relief of Louise Alford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 2276. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide for payment by the Federal Government of a portion of the costs of certain works of improvement constructed for purposes of water conservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. J. Res. 79. Joint resolution designating the last week in October of each year as National Farm-City Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on a Just and Lasting Peace; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HENNINGS (for himself, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL):

S. J. Res. 81. Joint resolution to provide for the acceptance and maintenance of presidential libraries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENNINGS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

ACCEPTANCE AND MAINTENANCE OF PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARIES

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. SCHOEPPEL] I introduce, for appropriate action a joint resolution to provide for the acceptance and maintenance of presidential libraries.

This joint resolution proposes to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 by authorizing the General Services Administration to take over and operate any presidential library when it is offered to the United States as a gift. This legislation establishes a method for integrating future presidential libraries, with their historically valuable documents, into our national recordkeeping system.

In our more recent history, the institution of the presidential library has evolved as the most desirable way of taking care of the papers and mementos of a President after he leaves office. President Herbert Hoover placed his papers in the Hoover Library on war, revolution, and peace on the campus of the University of Leland Stanford. President Franklin D. Roosevelt gave his papers to the Federal Government in the Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park. The Congress authorized the acceptance of this library and placed it under the jurisdiction of the National Archives by a joint resolution approved July 18, 1939—Public Resolution 30, 76th Congress—President Harry S. Truman proposes to dispose of his papers in the same way, placing them in a library which is now being built in Independence, Mo., and which will be offered as a gift to the United States. Steps are now being taken, with President Eisenhower's approval, to place his papers at Abilene, Kans., in a library to be constructed near the Eisenhower family home where he spent his boyhood and young manhood. In all these cases the presidential library was built, or will be built, without cost to the Federal Government. Federal operation of archival institutions such as these is not only beneficial to the cause of historical study and research, but also offers a means of preserving other Federal records of local or regional value in the areas in which they have been accumulated.

The immediate occasion for this proposed legislation is the fact that the Harry S. Truman Library is already under construction at Independence, Mo., and will, before very long, be offered to the Government together with the land on which it stands, its equipment, and the papers and other historical materials of President Truman.

Under this proposed legislation, the Government will be able to take advantage of the generous motives of a President's associates and friends whose interests in a memorial provide us with the expensive physical facilities and equipment for an archival depository at no cost to the Nation's taxpayers. There could be no better memorial, no more lasting tribute, than a living institution dedicated to research and to the preservation in impartial hands of the documentary source materials of our Nation's history.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 81) to provide for the acceptance and maintenance of presidential libraries, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS (for himself, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT of 1933—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUSH submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 972) to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. THYE:

Address delivered by him at the Rice County Farmers Union picnic, at Faribault, Minn., on June 19, 1955.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Address delivered by him before the American Legion Convention at Tucson, Ariz., on June 17, 1955.

Address delivered by him before the Michigan Christian Endeaver Convention, at Grand Rapids, Mich., on June 18, 1955.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOHN C. BAKER TO BE REPRESENTATIVE ON THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senate received today the nomination of John C. Baker, of Ohio, to be the Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, vice Preston Hotchkis, resigned. I wish to give notice that this nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

LET US TAP SCIENTIFIC GENIUS FOR UNITED STATES DEFENSE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on this, the opening day of the United Nations Conference in San Francisco, marking the 10th anniversary of the U. N. Charter, the hopes and prayers of all the people of the world are with the United Nations in its great mission. Essential to that mission is, of course, the adequate preparedness and leadership of the United States, the standard bearer of the free world.

I turn, therefore, to the pending bill authorizing $31.8 billion in funds for the United States Defense Department. I desire to urge now, as I have urged consistently in the past, that in our discussion of the question of defense, we start thinking in terms of the quality of our scientific technology rather than of the mere quantity of conventional arms. In other words, merely the number of ground divisions or the number of sea units or even the number of fighter planes is far less significant in these times than it has ever been in our history.

What counts is the answer to these questions: Do our weapons reflect the latest advances in scientific technology? Have we reached out and fully tapped

the genius of American scientists, and the genius of allied scientists in our effort to cope with the three military threats of our time?

What are these three threats? They are: First, nuclear warfare; second, bacteriological warfare; third, chemical warfare.

In this morning's New York Times there appears on the front page an article by Harry Schwartz, distinguished specialist on Russian affairs for that great newspaper. Mr. Schwartz' article begins: "A new emphasis on the importance of surprise attack in the age of nuclear weapons is being openly disseminated by Soviet military leaders in the Soviet press."

Not only are the Russians emphasizing surprise, but they are building on a crash basis the long-range weapons to accomplish surprise. They are proceeding at breakneck speed toward the development of an intercontinental missile—a guided missile or ballistic missile. Such a missile might reach any target in the United States 30 minutes after it is fired.

This missile development becomes even more significant, therefore, than the number of our long-range B–52 bombers. Fortunately, in the pending bill, a third of a billion dollars more is provided for these B–52's. But I say that this is not the complete answer.

Moreover, I say that the point of importance is not necessarily the amount of money which we spend, but how the money is expended. If we are to spend $30 or $40 billions, to train ground troops in "squads right," "squads left," parade drill, and the like, we will hardly be adequately prepared.

Is the money, therefore, going to be used for advancing our scientific technology? Or is it going to be used merely to increase the amount of conventional arms and conventional troops and conventional weapons?

This is not a partisan issue, and I would sincerely regret any attempt to make it such. This is an issue which transcends the Eisenhower administration or the Truman administration. It is a question of where the military chiefs are putting their emphasis.

Meanwhile, the development of nuclear weapons is proceeding at a fantastic pace. On last Saturday night, I spoke in Sheboygan, Wis., before a State convention of American veterans of World War II. I pointed out that, in accordance with a recent speech by Dr. Willard Libby, member of the Atomic Energy Commission, certain facts are now becoming universally known. Those facts demonstrate that radioactive fallout can contaminate an area, not merely of 7,000 square miles downwind, but of 100,000 square miles. I repeat, 100,000 square miles.

What is worse, the radioactivity can be, indeed, may be, exceedingly persistent. The radioactivity may last, not for 1 day or 2 days, but for weeks or months. It may be absorbed by plants, which in turn will be eaten by animals, which in turn will provide the basis for human food, either as milk or meat or in some other form.

What is the answer to this radioactive problem? I do not profess to know it. But I do know that for every weapon, there can be a counterweapon. For every poison, there can be an antidote. We must find the new weapons; then we must find answers to the new weapons. We must discover the new poisons; and then we must discover the antidotes to the new poisons.

This is a subject to challenge the scientific genius of America. But the scientists must be in a position to do the job. If they are held back, if they are regimented by the brass, if they are not given full opportunity, they can hardly come up with the answers.

There are strong evidences that our scientists are not happy with the present state of military affairs. There are strong evidences that they feel their new ideas are not being sufficiently applied. I feel that this situation should be resolved by getting the best possible teamwork between our scientists and our military leaders.

Much of the history of our country in terms of the development of new weapons, unfortunately, involves the story of the bitter resistance of military leaders to the introduction of such weapons. We certainly do not want that to happen. We dare not risk another Pearl Harbor, because it could be the last such chapter in our history.

These, then, are a few of my reactions to the pending bill:

In summary, the important point is not necessarily the amount of money spent, but where the money is spent, and whether the money is put into the most advanced weapons and weapons systems the mind of man can devise.

I send to the desk the text of Mr. Schwartz's article from this morning's New York Times, and ask that it be followed by the text of my address before the Wisconsin State Department of AMVETS. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and address were ordered to printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 20, 1955]

SOVIET NOW CALLS SURPRISE KEY FACTOR IN NUCLEAR WAR

(By Harry Schwartz)

A new emphasis on the importance of surprise attack in the age of nuclear weapons is being openly disseminated by Soviet military leaders in the Soviet press. The concept that such an attack by planes or guided missiles delivering atomic and hydrogen weapons may be decisive in war is apparently being incorporated in Soviet strategic doctrine.

This new emphasis on surprise attack and on the Soviet Union's ability to use it is a key point in recent articles by Marshal Alexander M. Vasilevsky, Deputy Defense Minister; Marshal Pavel A. Rotmistrov, chief of tank troops, and other Soviet military figures.

Coming in a period when the Soviet Union has demonstrated its possession of significant numbers of intercontinental jet bombers, the articles appear aimed at two goals: To readjust the thinking of Soviet military men to the new Soviet long-range attack capabilities and to warn the West that the Soviet Union will not hesitate to use its long-range bombers for blows on foreign soil if it deems it necessary to do so.

Marshal Rotmistrov and others writing in this vein quote with approval Lenin's statement that "an army would behave foolishly or even criminally if it did not prepare itself to master every kind of weapon, every means and device of warfare that is or can be used by the enemy."

The warning to the West is most explicit in a recent article by Lt. Gen. S. S. Shatilov, deputy chief of the Main Political Administration of the Ministry of Defense. He warns the "generals and admirals of the imperialist camp" to remember that "atomic weapons, and equally surprise acts, are double-edged weapons."

A major article spread over two pages of the Soviet Army newspaper Krasnaya Zvezda assails "some of our military comrades" who think only in defensive terms as victims of "narrow-minded, pacifist ideology." Soviet disclaimers of aggressive intent, the article continues, do not mean that in case of attack "Soviet armed forces cannot transfer military activities to the territory of the enemy, cannot strike and destroy the aggressors everywhere, on whatever territory they are to be found."

That modern weapons have resulted in a change of Soviet military doctrine is indicated most explicitly by Marshal Rotmistrov. He attacks Soviet writings on military science for ignoring the importance of surprise attack under modern conditions and stressing only the old line that "the permanently existing factors decide the fate of war." In Soviet parlance the "permanently existing factors" are such matters as a nation's economic strength and the state of its morale.

He adds: "The imperialist aggressors count on winning victories over the peace-loving states by means of surprise attack. This means that we must not passively react to this kind of military cadres with general considerations, but must seriously, with all conviction, reveal the growing role of surprise attack and raise the vigilance and fighting readiness of the entire personnel composition of the army, air force, and fleet."

As part of the new stress on the importance of surprise attack, General Shatilov demands that Soviet writers give an honest account of the confusion, chaos, and defeat suffered by the Soviet Union in 1941 following Hitler's attack. He accuses them of having presented an idealized picture of this period as one of active defense proceeding along planned lines, a picture he indicates is completely untrue.

Marshal Rotmistrov, General Shatilov, and other writers also demand a new attitude and respect for bourgeois military science. They call for recognition of the fact that the capitalist world can make advances that Soviet military men must know, and they condemn disdain for and ignorance of military thinking outside the Soviet bloc. They suggest that past undue depreciation of Western military achievements and ability has tended to result in a complacent attitude dangerous for the Soviet Union.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE STATE CONVENTION OF AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II, AT SHEBOYGAN, WIS., ON JUNE 18, 1955

It is a great privilege to address my friends of AMVETS. I say, my friends, advisedly, because over the years from the very birth of your organization, I have watched your progress with admiration, with esteem, and with delight. I have been gratified at your vigor, your forward-looking approach, particularly in the field of American leadership and partnership in the free world. I have admired your constructive deeds in all the communities with AMVETS chapters.

Back in 1947 and 1948, it was my privilege during the 80th Congress—as chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary—to offer the bill which granted a national charter to AMVETS.

Subsequently, I was pleased to be honored by an award of recognition from National AMVETS.

And it has been my further pleasure down through the years to address AMVETS departments and chapters on many occasions—both your fine Wisconsin department, and other departments as well, most recently—just a few weeks ago—the Ohio State Department of AMVETS.

POSSIBLE SUBJECTS OF INTEREST TODAY

In thinking over the message which I might bring to you this evening, many possibilities suggested themselves to me.

I thought I might talk with you—and in turn get the benefit of your own ideas—on the vital problem of America's Reserve forces. I thought, for example, that I might devote a great deal of attention to the absolute necessity of quickly passing the pending—but bogged-down—legislation for a 2.9 million man Ready Reserve, coupled with a sound selective service policy to assure adequate American preparedness. We of the Senate have just approved a draft-extension bill, but regrettably, the Reserve bill is still tied up.

I thought that I might make reference in detail to the work of our National Guard, in particular, to our famed and universally admired 32d Division—our Red Arrow men—and to the great significance of citizen-soldier readiness for civil defense and other purposes.

I might have referred at some length to legislation affecting this audience, in particular, and 18 million other Americans—who are veterans of our Armed Forces. For example, I could have referred to the problem of essential new veterans' facilities at Wood, Wis., a matter which I am now urging in the form of my bill, S. 1531. Present obsolete facilities at Wood, some of which date back as far as 1871, are completely antiquated and are a disgrace to the Nation which was saved by these heroes of past battlefields.

And I could have turned and referred to the promising situation in our general economy as a whole.

To our rising third of a trillion dollars gross national product.

America's 62 million employed.

The hopeful prospects for still more jobs.

The bright outlook as regards stable prices.

The possibility of tax relief next year.

The opportunity for liberalizing social security, the need for extending such pension coverage, as in the instance of my bill to give optional coverage to attorneys-at-law.

I could have referred to these domestic problems and to many others of interest to you and to me.

THE GREATEST CHALLENGE—SURVIVAL

But I have decided, my friends, to devote the bulk of my address tonight to a single theme, a single great subject.

It is the overriding subject of our time—the one subject of greatest importance to every single one of you and to me, and to all those and to everything we hold dear.

My subject is an 8-letter word, but the biggest 8-letter challenge facing this Nation. My subject is: Survival.

THE THREE HORSEMEN OF MODERN WAR

Survival against what?

Survival in the face of the threat of International communism, survival against the deadly threat of a third world war. Survival against the three horsemen of modern mass destruction, nuclear warfare, bacteriological warfare, chemical warfare.

Survival in this world which has been contracted and foreshortened by the greatest outburst of inventiveness in man's history. This inventiveness can open up a new golden age of plenty. Or a new dark age of near-suicide for the race.

Yes, we must concentrate on survival in the face of the atom—the fissioned or fusioned atom. The mighty atom is source of unlimited potential power, the source of untold possible blessings for mankind, the source of almost inexhaustible light, fuel, power. It is the source which can bring us comforts, standards and conveniences rivaling any that we have ever known.

Or the atom can, in a blinding flash, in a mushroom fireball, cause mass slaughter too frightful almost to contemplate.

WHAT 30 BOMBS MIGHT DO TO UNITED STATES

More than a year ago, on March 1, 1954, a fusion weapon was exploded in the Pacific proving grounds. Radioactive fallout from that explosion reportedly rendered unsafe for human habitation an area of 7,000 square miles. That radioactive area could have been larger or smaller, depending on the nature of the bomb.

Then, within the past week, a newspaper observer wrote regarding a significant speech of Atomic Energy Commissioner Willard F. Libby. Wrote this observer, Mr. Warren Unna:

"According to Libby, a single 10-megaton bomb, one equal to the explosive power of 10 million tons of TNT, could shower 1,100 pounds of fallout dust over a 100,000 square mile area. At such a rate, 30 carefully placed bombs could blanket the entire United States."

I repeat, "30 carefully placed bombs" might theoretically blanket the 3 million square miles of continental United States.

Now, friends of Amvets, like yourselves, I am a layman on this nuclear science or weapon subject. I do not presume to have the technical background to evaluate with any degree of expertness—the widespread press and scientific reports and speculation on this subject.

But, I do know that each passing day brings new evidence that military science is progressing, not at an arithmetic rate, but at a geometric rate in packing more millions of tons of TNT power into each bomb.

Nuclear bombs are getting deadlier. They are getting cheaper. They are getting so numerous in our own and in the Soviet Union's stockpile as utterly to change many of our concepts of military defense and of foreign policy.

The plain fact of the matter is that nuclear science has already reached a point where a third world war becomes not just a dreadful possibility which we would like to avoid. It becomes the deadliest sort of universal catastrophe against which, every thinking nation must move heaven and earth, so to speak, so that it never comes to pass.

Any man who talks lightly of the possibility of war is a man who is out of his senses, or one who is deliberately ignoring the basic facts of the atomic age.

SLAVERY WOULD BE WORSE THAN WAR

But, let me make it perfectly clear that, although I regard the possibility of war as an almost unmitigated horror, I regard the possibility of slavery under communism as a worse horror.

There is no single person in this audience tonight who does not share my feeling. There is no single American who would not, in a showdown, be willing to risk war—as terrible as it would be—in order to save this Republic.

But my suggestion is that we use all our ingenuity, our diplomacy, our God-given brains in conjunction with our allies—to make sure that such a showdown never comes, that we never have to face the grim alternative of either going to war of losing our freedom.

In my judgment, we will never face such a possibility, provided we are strong, provided our alliance with our friends remains invincible, provided our diplomacy is effective.

But still more needs be done along all these lines.

COMING CONFERENCES OFFER GREAT POSSIBILITIES

Fortunately, three golden opportunities are coming up ahead. At the start of next week, begins one such opportunity at San Francisco, birthplace of the United Nations, when we observe the 10th anniversary of the founding of the U. N. Charter. I say to you, of AMVETS, that AMVETS' consistent support of the United Nations and of its charter is a source of deepest gratification to me.

Continue to stand by the United Nations. While it is only a mechanism, it is one which has achieved splendid success and will achieve still more success if we breathe more of the spirit of life into it.

A second great opportunity comes in Geneva almost a month from now at the Big Four meeting "at the summit."

It will not produce the millenium. We cannot expect overnight solutions of 8 years of East-West tensions. But the meeting can explore. It can clarify. It can permit of progress. And this can occur without the slightest appeasement and always with honor. We can trust our President. He merits our fullest confidence at Geneva or anywhere else. He will not be deceived by the Soviets. But he will make an honest try in frank discussion.

And then, a month thereafter at Geneva, too, occurs the historic United Nations Atoms-for-Peace Conference. It will be a great landmark in man's search to apply the miracles of science to this age and succeeding ages.

At this conference, there is much evidence that the Soviet Union is going to put on a mammoth display of her presumed progress in nuclear science. The conference will in effect be a great showplace of the rival scientific achievements of West and East. We ourselves will be setting up what is termed "a swimming pool" reactor there. Great numbers of scientific papers are already being circulated. Those who have glimpsed the Soviet papers say that the Soviet papers indicate very considerable progress on the part of the Russians.

Our allies, as well, are likewise going to use Geneva as a great showplace. It is not generally realized but some of our allied countries are much further ahead in their peaceful application of atomic energy than we are, in some specialized lines. All this indicates that we must look to our laurels and must not become smug or overconfident.

DON'T FALL FOR RED PROPAGANDA

Meanwhile, current Soviet propaganda tactics of so-called peaceful coexistence can be particularly misleading and disarming, if we and our allies were naively to allow ourselves to be fooled.

Instead, we must be on our guard; we must be vigiliant; our friends must not and will not fall for so-called neutralists lures.

Simultaneously, we must take additional step for peace. They must be bold, imaginative steps. We must not permit ourselves to get caught in a rut or tired hackneyed approaches.

LET'S HAVE A GENERAL ASSEMBLY TO SEE H-BOMB EXPERIMENT

And so, I want to offer now certain additional suggested steps.

First, I say that when, as, and if additional thermonuclear experiments occur in the western Pacific or elsewhere, that observers from the Soviet Union, observers from Red China, observers from the satillite countries—as well as from friendly and neutral nations be invited to witness these explosions.

Yes, let's have a U. N. General Assembly meeting—formally or informally—at a weapon testing ground—to see at firsthand

the absolute importance of an all-out-effort for peace. Such a U. N. meeting need not endanger necessary security precautions covering the nature or construction of the weapon itself.

The idea of the Soviets, in particular, witnessing a fission or fusion test is not a personal idea of mine. It is basically the suggestion of Thomas E. Murray, an able member of the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

Commissioner Murray, in his outstanding suggestion, said:

"How can the world take any chance that each one in authority is not thoroughly familiar with what all-out atomic war would really mean? What a tragedy it would be if, after a nuclear holocaust, it was disclosed that those who struck the atomic spark had no real understanding of the spread of nuclear fire."

The fact of the matter is that there is much evidence to confirm that the leaders of the Soviet Union, and the especially insulated leaders of the Peking government very definitely do not understand that they are playing around with matches near a fuse which, if lit, might disintegrate them and much of mankind.

As proof, consider the ridiculous propaganda mouthings from Moscow and Peking. These statements run to the effect that, in event of nuclear war, only one side—the so-called capitalist side—would be destroyed.

That is utter nonsense. The fact of the matter is that, as some of the foremost spokesmen of the United States have frankly pointed out, both sides, in the event of nuclear war, would suffer frightful devastation. No less a person than Gen. Douglas MacArthur has pointed out that, in the event of world war III, the principal difference between victory and vanquished might only be in the degree of mutual destruction, because the three horsemen of modern war are such that neither side could escape the ghastliest consequences.

RED LEADERS FOOLING THEMSELVES AND/OR THEIR PEOPLE

But the Soviets or the Peking leaders are guilty of either 1 or 2 errors: (a) Either they are literally blinding themselves to reality, completely ignoring evidence.

Or (b) they are not blinding themselves to reality, are aware of the facts, but are simply deceiving their people by empty boastfulness.

Both of these errors are exceedingly dangerous to the cause of peace.

There are strong indications that Peking, in particular, does not really understand what nuclear war might mean. The Red regime has filled itself with so many lies about alleged germ warfare, that it may not know a truth from a lie if it saw one.

And, as a matter of fact, the Soviet masters of the Kremlin are probably guilty likewise of stuffing themselves with so many lies that, after a while they, themselves, may lose some touch with reality.

They do tend ordinarily to be realists; they are practical, they are cold and hard and merciless. But the chronic tendency of a dictatorship is often to swallow its own lies.

Perhaps, therefore, the Reds may really think that they would escape nuclear devastation and may completely underestimate it.

And, so, I say that to help avert any misconception, to avert the Soviets from possible triggering an explosion of ghastly unforseen dimensions, let them see at first hand what nuclear war might mean by witnessing a thermonuclear test explosion.

But that will not be enough—if the people remain largely uninformed.

WE DARE REDS TO INFORM THEIR PEOPLE

So, the second phase of my suggestion is that the pressure of world opinion be brought to bear upon the Soviets so that they print the blunt facts of what nuclear devastation might really mean to Moscow, Leningrad, etc. Let them print them on the front pages of "Pravda" and "Izvestia."

Print similar hard facts in Chinese Red newspapers and broadcast them over the Peking radio to the Chinese people.

Yes, let us challenge the Soviet Axis—Moscow and Peking—to tell the grim truth to their own peoples and to the satellite world.

The reason for my suggestion is obvious:

PUBLIC OPINION SHOULD BE CHECK AND BALANCE

In the United States, public opinion can be a brake on official leadership. It is a check and balance. If leadership errs, then public opinion can put it right.

Fortunately, we have sound leadership in the United States. But even so, it benefits from this check and balance.

In the Communist world, there is no such check and balance. A handful of men in the Kremlin, a handful of men in Peking can make a decision, an utterly wrong and suicidal decision. But there is virtually no domestic check and balance on it, because public opinion is neither informed nor in very much of a position to express itself.

So, let public opinion in the Communist world at least be informed of the significance of nuclear war. I am convinced that public opinion behind the Iron Curtain will find ways to express itself, somehow.

I am convinced that not even a Communist dictatorship can completly avoid the pressure of aroused public opinion, particularly on a subject of this nature.

Let us tell the leadership behind the Iron Curtain and the peoples of the world that this country and its great free press will continue to publish all the details that security will allow, concerning the dreadful possible meaning of atomic conflict.

We do not, of course, propose to give to the Soviets any secrets, "on a silver platter," or in any other way. But we do propose to continue to inform our people.

OUR PEOPLE ENTITLED TO MORE FACTS

Yes, let us see that our people are even better informed than they have been permitted to be—thus far.

Let not the necessary goal of security be used, as it has sometimes been used, as a coverup to hide embarrassing facts. The long lag in publicly revealing the radioactive fallout menace—was both unfortunate and unjustified.

The American people are not children; they can and should be told the hard facts of life. They cannot come to intelligent decisions, if they are denied basic facts—which the Soviets probably already have in many instances, anyway. Civil defense here can be utterly hobbled—if it is acting on the basis of obsolete assumptions on weapons long since superseded.

DARE WE IGNORE INTERCONTINENTAL MISSILE?

And what is the use preparing ourselves against, let us say, slow-moving Soviet piston bombers which have long since been replaced by swifter combat formations of intercontinental Red jets?

What is the use of ignoring Red progress toward an intercontinental guided or ballistic missile?

Dare we allow ourselves to be guilty of the same sin of which the Soviets are guilty—keeping our people less informed than they should be?

No; "give light and the people will find their own way." Let the people know the truth and nothing but the truth about radioactive fallout or any other developments. Let this be to the extent that a carefully evaluated—not exaggerated—security standard will allow.

WE DO NOT BOAST ABOUT WEAPONS

I come to the third phase of my suggestions. I have said that the world should see at first hand what a thermonuclear explosion really looks like and means. Then, let the world's peoples be thoroughly informed.

But, thirdly, let this whole matter be approached in a manner of sincerest American humility.

It will do us little good to show the world what fission-fusion weapons really mean, if any part of the world thinks that we are boastful about our destructive powers.

That is really the furthest thought from our mind. We of the Judao-Christian heritage do not boast about our ability to slaughter men.

The Russian people lost 12 million souls in World War II. They have suffered frightfully under the yoke of their own masters. We do not want a single additional Russian boy to die in a war with us or anyone else, or want any other boy to die in avoidable conflict.

We Americans abhor force and violence and we take up arms only in defense.

There is no thinking American who has the slightest intrinsic feeling of pride in the mass destruction which fell on Hiroshima or on Nagasaki. But those two bombs were necessary instruments of a war which we did not want, a war we tried to avoid, a war which, when it came, we were determined to win quickly with the instruments that were available to us.

We do not doubt for one moment that the evil Axis leaders who perpetrated that war on the world, would have used weapons of infintely greater horror on us if they had invented them first and were in a position to deliver them first.

No; we do not intend to boast. There is not the slightest feeling of gratification in our possible ability to exterminate fellow human beings.

So after the experiment, let the world continue to hear ever more clearly the true story of what the people of the United States and the Government of the United States feel in their hearts. It is a feeling of profound chagrin and dismay that 2,000 years after the birth of the Prince of Peace, it should be necessary even to have to conduct such experiments.

CONCLUSION

This, then, is my threefold suggestion. It is necessarily but a small phase of a comprehensive program for peace.

I know that you of AMVETS will not fail in your responsibilities toward this great goal.

It has been a great privilege and pleasure to be with you this evening, and I hope that I will have a similar opportunity in the not too distant future.

THE CONQUEST OF BANG'S DISEASE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on a great many occasions I have commented on the Senate floor on the issue of all-out help to American agriculture in the struggle to conquer diseases of livestock and plants. My own State of Wisconsin—America's dairyland—has been in the forefront, down through the years, in the battle against diseases affecting dairy cattle.

Two particular diseases have been combatted by Wisconsin scientific agriculture to a greater extent than any other State of the Union. Those diseases are bovine tuberculosis and brucellosis—known as Bang's disease. The battle against both these ailments has literally cost fortunes to the farmers of my State. The very first county in the United States which tested livestock for tuberculosis was Barron County—home of the dairy farm which my father owned, and which I owned, after his passing.

The battle against brucellosis has been particularly costly. Cattle reacting to the tests have been sent to slaughter. Milk production has often gone down, sometimes by as much as 20 percent; and many calves have been lost.

But at long last, these scourges have been put on their way out. These scourges, which have afflicted livestock for centuries, are now on their way to complete elimination.

In last Monday's Janesville Daily Gazette and in other Wisconsin newspapers carrying his widely-read column, Mr. John Wyngaard wrote an article on the conquest of Bang's disease. The theme of his article is that here was a costly, voluntary program which the farmers worked out for themselves, which they themselves applied at the grassroots. Here was a true lesson in democracy and in voluntary achievement. I hope this experience will prove a lesson to us all.

Moreover, I trust that we, of the Congress, will continue to grant to the Department of Agriculture every dime which is necessary for the final elimination of these scourges. I trust similarly, of course, that we will continue our efforts against the event more important target—the ailments which afflict man.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Wyngaard's article be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW BANG'S DISEASE CONTROL ACT RESULT OF FARM INITIATIVE

(By John Wyngaard)

MADISON.—Sometimes items in the news become so repetitive that they tend to become trite. So it may be with Bang's disease legislation. Yet the Wisconsin Legislature the other day enacted a new livestock disease control act that will draw attention in dairying circles from one part of the country to the other.

For this new act will require all of some 150,000 dairymen in this State, representing a herd of more than 3 million dairy animals, to come within the terms of the compulsory brucellosis elimination program.

The achievement is comparable to the legislation of a quarter of a century ago outlawing bovine tuberculosis. That represented essentially a public health measure. Brucellosis is not alarmingly dangerous to the public health. It is primarily an economic problem of the farmer, and particularly since some of the major market areas of the country are moving to erect embargoes against producing areas not certified to be free of the disease or under workable public controls.

WHAT IT MEANS

The new act is not nearly as punitive as it sounds. It provides that whenever the herd owners in 54 Wisconsin counties, upon their own voluntary action, come within the compulsory testing and eliminating phase of the State-sponsored control program that compulsory program is effective statewide.

That means the act is effective immediately, because farmers in 55 counties have voluntarily voted such controls for themselves.

And such voluntary controls have been under way, by means of dairymen's petitions, in all other counties, save one, so that the legislature was actually doing what farm sentiment demonstrably wanted done.

But the act has meaning in other directions. It gives the patient taxpayer some hope that this enormously costly problem of dairy cattle health is on the way toward solution. More than $25 million of the taxpayers' dollars have been poured into this control effort, including some of the futile enterprises that preceded the present statutory method of control adopted 4 years ago. Even today the State and Federal Governments are spending more than $2 million a year apiece within Wisconsin for testing cattle, and for paying herd owners for animals condemned to slaughter.

The legislature, in its basic brucellosis control law, left the initiative in the hands of the farmers. The new act making controls compulsory and statewide was enacted because progressive farmers had made voluntary controls work. The legislature in effect set up the machinery 4 years ago and invited the farmers to make it work.

DEMOCRACY WORKS

The legislature recognized that force in the early stages, no matter how well backed by factual evidence and scientific discoveries, would run against the grain of the sturdy rural citizen.

Instead, the legislature waited for the farmer to recognize his problem, appraise the best advice available on a solution, and take the initiative in solving his dilemma of marketing in an era of more discriminating buyers and ever more rigorous inspection.

It was a revealing demonstration of the democratic method, the instinctive political responsibility of the people of Wisconsin. It is reminiscent of a similar achievement in the field of rural school district reorganization. Force didn't work there, as was made clear in the 1930's. But when voluntary methods were adopted later, and the facts gradually became clear to all, the people moved to adopt their school district boundaries to the facts of modern technology and geography, with equally astounding consequences.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED NATIONS—POEM BY MILFORD E. SHIELDS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on this 10th anniversary of the United Nations, I think it appropriate that we give some recognition to this event. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a poem by Coloradc's poet laureate, Milford E. Shields, of Durango.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR MARCH OF NATIONS

(United Nations 10th anniversary, June 20, 1955)

The march of man has been an upward climb
Along the highway of expectant time:
From out the mists into expanding light
Have men progressed in dignity and right.

Men have forged nations with proud history,
In flaming concepts lived and labored free:
Almighty God has witnessed from on high
Their blazing banners gracing brilliant sky.

Our cavalcade of nations marching on
Has moved into an even brighter dawn:
The rights of peoples loved and understood,
We have united in true brotherhood.

We have marched on in cadence and in beat
That was the force of decade now complete:
Our march of nations is man's destined climb
Upon the highroad to the stars sublime.

—*Milford E. Shields.*

REMOVAL OF CLOAK OF SECRECY FROM APPLICATIONS FOR TAX-EXEMPT STATUS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, for some time there has been under discussion with officials of the Departments of Treasury and Justice the question of removing the cloak of secrecy from applications for a tax-exempt status, as well as the publication of the names of all those to whom such exemption has been granted.

In this connection it seems that everyone is in agreement as to the wisdom of making public, information regarding those who are given a tax-exempt status. However, the solution to this problem has developed into a stalemate.

The Treasury Department is apparently taking the position that under the existing law it has the necessary authority, and it is willing to proceed. The Department of Justice is taking the position that the existing law does not permit such disclosure, and that some action by Congress is required.

To settle this controversy, several weeks ago I requested from each Department its recommendations for the necessary proposed legislation, which I have offered to introduce and to help expedite its enactment. I took the position that if there is any question as to the existing authority, a law clarifying the point should be enacted. To depend upon administrative action alone might provide the desired answer today, but at a future time another administration could rule otherwise.

Since both agencies have indicated their agreement in principle upon the proposal that the cloak of secrecy should be removed, I am appealing to both Departments to stop quibbling over procedure and to cooperate in recommending the necessary proposed legislation.

PROPOSED MEMBERSHIP OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE ORGANIZATION FOR TRADE COOPERATION

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement by me on the President's proposal for United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN, OF IOWA

The President has asked the Congress to assent to United States membership in a new organization called the Organization for Trade Cooperation, which will administer the general agreement on tariffs and trade, known as the GATT.

When the President's message was delivered last April, I immediately sought clarification as to the differences in the aims and objectives of this new organization and the defunct international trade organization, which would have come into being if the United States had taken the lead in ratifying the Habana Charter. I have made an exhaustive review of the Habana Charter and there has never been any doubt in my mind that its provisions were not in the best interest of the United States. Our economy has achieved its great strength because it

has been dedicated to free enterprise principles. We have shunned socialism and have endeavored to shape our policies so as to stimulate the imagination and the initiative of free citizens to produce the good things of life in a competitive climate. The Habana Charter discriminated against private enterprise in favor of those enterprises which were owned and operated by governments. It included provisions for intergovernmental commodity agreements and an elaborate code supposed to prevent restrictive business practices but only applicable to private firms and not to public enterprises. In effect, it proposed world antitrust laws setting up machinery for complaints and prosecution without defining any substantive law.

When the Habana Charter was rejected by the Congress, the Truman administration proceeded to implement portions of the ITO concept through the United Nations. The Eisenhower administration, when it assumed office, inherited a difficult situation in that our Government had taken the lead in sponsoring agreements to handle restrictive business practices within the United Nations. We had also given encouragement to the concept of stabilizing commodity price levels through active participation in various U. N. study groups. My views on these problems are contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 18, 1955, pages 1819–1828, in which I discussed these two U. N. activities at length.

I am now happy to be able to inform the Senate that the State Department, under its present able leadership, was able to persuade the Economic and Social Council to adopt a resolution on restrictive business practices without any dissent, a remarkable achievement in itself, which disposes of the concepts inherited from Chapter V of the Habana Charter. I attach hereto the resolution of the United Nations Economic and Social Council, E/Res. (XIX)/14 adopted Thursday, May 26, as follows:

"RESTRICTIVE BUSINESS PRACTICES

"The Economic and Social Council:

"Having considered the reports prepared by the Secretary-General and the Ad Hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices, and the comments transmitted by governments, specialized agencies, intergovernmental organizations, and nongovernmental organizations pursuant to council resolutions 375 (XIII) and 487 (XVI).

"Noting with satisfaction that these reports indicate that a number of governments have undertaken new measures, or strengthened existing measures, to prevent or control restrictive business practices or their harmful effects; and that there is a growing awareness of the fact that, even though the precise form or effect of restrictive business practices differs throughout the world, these practices may have harmful effects upon economic development, employment, and international trade;

"Recognizing that national action and international cooperation are needed in order to deal effectively with restrictive business practices affecting international trade, but taking into account the fact that international action in this field would not be effective without sufficient support by member states;

"1. Reaffirms its continuing concern with the existence in international trade of restrictive business practices which have harmful effects on the attainment of higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development;

"2. Urges governments to continue the examination of restrictive business practices with a view to the adoption of laws, measures and policies which will counteract such effects;

"3. Recommends to member states to continue to communicate to the Secretary-General information concerning laws, measures and policies adopted by them in respect to such restrictive business practices;

"4. Requests the Secretary-General:

(a) To circulate to member states any further information received from governments;

"(b) To circulate to member states the views of appropriate intergovernmental bodies and agencies in respect of this question;

"(c) To assist in making such arrangements—at the request of interested governments—as may be appropriate to enable them to avail themselves of any opportunities to share the experience gained in countries having an established body of law and practices in this field;

"(d) To suggest further consideration of the matter at a later session of the Council; and for this purpose, to continue to summarize information concerning restrictive practices in international trade and to prepare a bibliography on the nature of restrictive business practices and of their effect on economic development, employment, and international trade."

It will be noted that this resolution directs the attention of member governments to strengthening their own domestic laws so as to deal with restrictive and monopolistic practices. Our Government in the debates took the position that before any elaborate international machinery could be established to deal with such a problem, there must first be some agreement on the substantive law of restrictive business practices by each member state. This highlights the conflict which exists in all international forums in which we participate as our Government is dedicated to free enterprise economic; and many other countries, including some of our allies, have adopted socialism in one form or another.

Since the subject of restrictive business practices was to be discussed by the United Nations at its meeting in New York last month, the Secretary-General of the United Nations early this year asked members governments for their comments which would be helpful in the discussion of this subject. In reviewing the replies to the Secretary-General, I noted that several countries proposed that the GATT organization, which will be replaced by OTC, be given jurisdiction in this field.

The comments from the Norwegian Government are most illuminating. I submit for the record the statement by Norway to the Secretary-General, as follows:

"II. COMMENTS FROM GOVERNMENTS

"Comments of Norway

"The Norwegian Government agrees in general with the principles expressed in the [Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices] (E/2380). It considers that the control of restrictive business practices in international trade should be carried out largely in accordance with the provisions contained in chapter V of the Habana Charter, possibly amended as proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee of the Economic and Social Council.

"It is generally accepted that restrictive business practices in the form of international trusts and cartels adversely affect international trade and that such practices also in other respects would run contrary to the principles embodied in the Habana Charter. The contracting parties to GATT have as far as possible tried to incorporate these principles in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the contracting parties have based themselves on these principles in their efforts to expand world trade. The Norwegian Government considers that the problem of controlling restrictive business practices affecting international trade falls naturally within the scope of the contracting parties to GATT, and that the supervision of such provisions as may be agreed upon should consequently be placed within the competence of the contracting parties, which presumably would be in the most advantageous position to deal with the various questions of an international character having a direct bearing upon world trade. There exists a close interrelationship between restrictive business practices and such other restrictive practices in international trade which GATT has been designed to counteract. Consequently, the control of restrictive business practices should be conceived as a natural and necessary part of those functions for which GATT presently is responsible.

"The Norwegian Government does not consider it desirable to establish a separate organization to exercise the control of restrictive business practices.

"It considers that the provisions relating to restrictive business practices should be incorporated in GATT. Consequently, at the ninth session of the contracting parties the Norwegian Government together with the Danish and Swedish Governments suggested that the proposals of the ECOSOC Ad Hoc Committee should be taken as the basis for discussion at that session, with the exception of those articles proposed which related to the form of an organization in this field. The problems involved in connection with these latter articles were assumed to be settled by other provisions of GATT or by a special agreement on organizational matters in case the present machinery of GATT should be replaced by another form of organization.

"The Norwegian Government reserves its right to submit further comments and proposals when the matter is considered by the Economic and Social Council or the contracting parties to GATT. However, it is the considered opinion of the Norwegian Government that the Economic and Social Council should transmit the question of restrictive business practices to the contracting parties to GATT for consideration as soon as possible."

The United States delegation was, of course, aware that many of the members of the Economic and Social Council wanted to assign control over restrictive business practices to the Organization for Trade Cooperation. It is quite apparent that the resolution which was adopted forecloses this action.

I have been so fearful that some attempt might be made on the part of one of the countries in the United Nations to convert the Organization for Trade Cooperation into an organization similar to the International Trade Organization that I secured an official statement by the Department of State contrasting the terms of reference of these two organizations. I include in the record at this point this statement which was prepared by the Department of State:

"COMPARISON OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION WITH THE ORGANIZATION FOR TRADE COOPERATION

"This memorandum supplements the memorandum entitled 'Comparison of the ITO Charter and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade,' dated April 18, 1955. It is submitted in response to a request for a comparison of the scope and powers of the defunct International Trade Organization with those of the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation.

"The ITO would have been empowered to deal with a wide area of foreign economic policy in addition to commercial policy. Its charter contemplated procedures looking toward the prevention of restrictive business practices having a harmful effect on the expansion of production and trade; called upon members to take internal measures designed to maintain full and productive employment within their own territories; called upon members to eliminate unfair labor conditions; established procedures and criteria for conclusion of intergovernmental

commodity agreements; and provided for extensive measures for cooperation for economic development and reconstruction. All of these activities would have been administered by the ITO.

"The agreement on the OTC, on the other hand, limits its administrative functions to the field of commercial policy, and there is thus excluded from it all the other broad areas covered by the ITO. The OTC is primarily responsible for administering the GATT. It may also sponsor international negotiations in the trade field and serve as an intergovernmental forum where members may discuss and seek solution of other questions relating to international trade. Not covered by the agreement on the OTC would be the administration of agreements relating to such provisions of the ITO draft charter as were concerned with cartels, full employment, fair labor standards, commodity agreements, or economic development measures other than such measures relating to commercial policy matters."

Let me emphasize particularly this portion of the statement by the Department which from my standpoint is crucial:

"Not covered by the agreement on the OTC would be the administration of agreements relating to such provisions of the ITO draft charter as were concerned with cartels, full employment, fair labor standards, commodity agreements, or economic development measures other than such measures relating to commercial policy matters."

I am completely satisfied with the intent and purposes of the Department in regard to these aspects of the charter for the proposed OTC.

I now wish to discuss OTC in relation to its avowed purpose, namely, the administering of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Our country has always adhered in its dealings with other nations to a most-favored-nation policy. In other words, Mr. President, any concessions we granted to one friendly foreign country we granted to all, assuming that we, in turn, received similar treatment. Any other policy would be disastrous in terms of an effective foreign or commercial policy. Since 1934 we have negotiated numerous trade agreements in which we have made tariff concessions to a particular country in return for other concessions granted to us. Our concessions were then generalized under the most-favored-nations clause to all of the countries with whom we had friendly relations. Finally we participated in a master agreement which became known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, in which all of these reductions were crystallized into one master document.

During this entire period the United States has not resorted to forms of trade discrimination such as multiple currencies, exchange controls, import licenses, etc. Imports into the United States are limited only by the tariff except for a few products where quota provisions apply under our agricultural program. Other countries have resorted to a multiplicity of currency restrictions, licensing and quantitative controls which have in many cases nullified the advantages we were to gain through reciprocal-trade negotiations. The purpose of OTC is to prevent these new impediments to trade and to protect the advantages we have secured by our concessions. Inasmuch as the Congress has extended the trade-agreements program for 3 more years, we have everything to gain and nothing to lose through participating in OTC provided that OTC does not stray from its present objectives.

I have no doubt whatsoever that the present administration means exactly what it said in the statement explaining the difference between the Organization for Trade Cooperation and the defunct International Trade Organization. However, the OTC agreement provides in part 4, article 16, that:

"Amendments to this agreement shall become effective, in respect of those members which accept them, upon acceptance by two-thirds of the members of the organization and thereafter in respect of each other member upon acceptance by it."

I have no fear that this administration would ever accept an amendment to the OTC agreement that would compromise its stated position. Unfortunately some future administration may not be so dedicated to these principles. Therefore, I shall support United States participation in OTC provided the resolution, which I know we shall adopt, contains a reservation that any new obligation to be imposed upon the United States as an amendment to this agreement can only be accepted by the United States with the concurrence of the Congress. Mr. President, with this one reservation I feel that we should wholeheartedly support the President in his effort to secure the maximum expansion of world trade which the Congress approved in its adoption of H. R. 1.

President Eisenhower and the able team he has assembled in the Department of State merit the confidence of all those who believe in the ultimate triumph of free-enterprise economics.

CONGRATULATIONS TO JACK FLECK ON WINNING THE NATIONAL OPEN GOLF CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, on yesterday one of the truly great stories of competitive athletics was written when Jack Fleck, golf professional, won the national open golf championship by defeating one of the truly all-time greats in the golfing world, Ben Hogan. Jack Fleck is from Davenport, Iowa; and I should like to call to the attention of the Senate his wonderful victory.

The story of yesterday's win has all the elements of a fairy story come true. Jack came from nowhere, to win the most coveted of all golf titles. This is his first major championship. In the practice rounds, Jack's game was not solid, and seemed to constitute no threat to the established golf leaders. Twice before, he had played in the National Open; but the highest he had finished was 52d. In Iowa, we knew him to be a great golfer and a fine person; but his tournament record did not predict this tremendous victory.

In defeating Ben Hogan, he conquered one of the truly great champions and one of Jack's personal favorites. To some extent he has patterned his game after that of Hogan, the "champ". He uses Hogan clubs; and, in some instances, the observer watching them play yesterday could detect a physical similarity in the way each played his game.

Jack Fleck portrayed the superb control and nerve that makes a champion. On Saturday afternoon he followed Hogan on the course, and knew the obstacles which faced him. Without wavering, he played his game, finishing with a tremendous "birdie" when he had to have it. Although many thrills and accomplishments are awaiting Jack Fleck, none will surpass those at the dramatic 18th hole he played on Saturday.

Jack has all the qualities needed to make a truly great champion. During the last few days he has proved the excellence of his golf game. He also indicated he has the emotional qualities to set him apart from the average person. When interviewed over the radio, following his victory, he quietly said, "The Lord must have been with me." These simple words show the humility and composure that mark the true champion.

The congratulations of all of us are extended to Jack, his wife, Gail, and their little boy. Although great things are in store for them in the years to come, they will look back on this occasion and will say to themselves, "This was our finest hour."

AGREEMENTS FOR COOPERATION ON THE CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, from time to time the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has published in the RECORD the text of the Agreements for Cooperation which the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 require to come before that committee.

On Wednesday, June 15, the Atomic Energy Commission deposited with the joint committee its proposed agreements for cooperation with the United Kingdom, with Canada, and with Belgium, relating to the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

On June 15 the Department of Defense also deposited with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy its proposed agreements for cooperation with the United Kingdom and with Canada relating to mutual-defense plans.

Hearings on all of these agreements are scheduled for the immediate future before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the joint committee will give very careful consideration to the agreements.

Today I ask unanimous consent to have the unclassified portions of the text of these agreements for cooperation published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the agreements for cooperation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION ON THE CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

The Government of the United States of America (including the United States Atomic Energy Commission) and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, on its own behalf and on behalf of the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority;

Considering that they have for several years been engaged in atomic energy programs within their respective countries and from the inception of these programs have collaborated closely in certain fields;

Considering that the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes is a major objective of each of these programs;

Believing that mutual benefit would result from further cooperation between them; and

Recognizing that for the present their main efforts in the field of atomic energy will be directed to defense but desiring also to promote the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes;

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

Scope of agreement

A. Subject to the provisions of this Agreement, the availability of material and personnel, and the applicable laws, regulations and license requirements in force in their respective countries, the Parties shall assist each other in the achievement of the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. It is the intent of the Parties that such assistance shall be rendered on a reciprocal basis.

B. The disposition and utilization of atomic weapons and the exchange of restricted data relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons shall be outside the scope of this Agreement.

C. The exchange of restricted data under this Agreement shall be subject to the following limitations:

(i) It shall extend only to that which is relevant to current or projected programs.

(ii) Restricted data which is primarily of military significance shall not be exchanged.

(iii) The development of submarine, ship, aircraft, and certainly package power reactors is presently concerned primarily with their military uses. Accordingly, restricted data pertaining to such reactors will not be exchanged until such time as these types of reactors warrant peacetime application and the exchange of information on these types of reactors may be agreed. Information on the adoption of these types of reactors to military use will not be exchanged. Likewise, restricted data pertaining primarily to any future reactor-types the development of which is concerned primarily with their military use will not be exchanged until such time as these types of reactors warrant civil application and exchange of information on these types of reactors may be agreed; and restricted data on the adaptation of these types of reactors to military use will not be exchanged.

(iv) Restricted data on specific experimental power, demonstration power, or power reactors will not be exchanged unless the reactor is currently in operation in the receiving country or is being considered seriously for construction by the receiving country as a source of power or as an intermediate step in a power production program. There shall, however, be exchanged such general information, including restricted data, on design and characteristics of various types of reactors as is required to permit evaluation and comparison of their potential use in a power production program.

D. This Agreement shall not require the exchange of any information which the Parties are not permitted to communicate because the information is privately developed and privately owned or has been received from another government.

E. The Parties will not transfer or export, or permit the transfer or export, under this Agreement of any material, equipment, or device which is primarily of a military character.

ARTICLE II

Exchange of information between the Commission and the Authority

Subject to the provisions of Article I, classified information in the specific fields set out below and unclassified information shall be exchanged between the Commission and the Authority with respect to the application of atomic energy to peaceful uses, including research and development relating to such uses and problems of health and safety connected therewith. The exchange of information provided for in this Article shall be accomplished through the various means available, including reports, conferences, and visits to facilities. The following are the fields in which classified information shall be exchanged.

A. Reactors

1. Fields of exchange:

(a) Reactor physics, including theory of and pertinent data relating to neutron bombardment reactions, neutron cross sections, criticality calculations, reactor kinetics, and shielding.

(b) Reactor engineering—theory of and data relating to such problems as reactor stress and heat transfer analysis insofar as these are pertinent to the overall design and optimization of the reactor.

(c) Properties of reactor materials—effects of operating conditions on the properties of reactor materials, including fuel, moderator, and coolant.

(d) Specification for reactor materials—final form specifications including composition, shape, and size, and special handling techniques of reactor materials including source material, special nuclear material, heavy water, reactor grade graphite, and zirconium.

(e) Reactor components—general performance specifications of reactor components.

(f) Over-all design and characteristics, and operational techniques and performance, of research, experimental power, demonstration power, and power reactors.

2. Detailed designs, detailed drawings and applied technology of reactors of the types referred to in subparagraph 1 (f) of this paragraph and of related components, equipment and devices in this field shall not be exchanged except as may be agreed.

3. The exchange of information under this paragraph shall include and be limited to information from the following sources and shall be accomplished in such a manner as to maintain a reciprocal basis of exchange:

(a) Information developed by and for the Commission and information developed by and for the public and private utility groups in the United States with the assistance of the Commission;

(b) Information developed by and for the Authority and information developed by and for the United Kingdom Electricity Supply Authorities with the assistance of the Authority.

B. Uranium and Thorium

Geology, exploration techniques, chemistry and technology of extracting uranium and thorium from their ores and concentrates, the chemistry, production technology and techniques of purification and fabrication of uranium and thorium compounds and metals, including design, construction, and operation of plants.

C. Properties of Materials

Physical, chemical, and nuclear properties of all elements, compounds, alloys, mixtures, special nuclear material, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes and their behavior under all conditions.

D. Technology of Production and Utilization of Materials

1. Technology of production and utilization, from laboratory experimentation up to pilot plant operations but not including design and operation of pilots plants except as may be agreed, of all elements, compounds, alloys, mixtures, special nuclear material, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes relevant to paragraphs A and E of this Article.

2. This paragraph shall not be construed as including:

(a) the exchange of restricted data pertaining to design, construction, and operation of production plants for the separation of U-235 from other uranium isotopes;

(b) the exchange of restricted data on the design, construction, and operation of specific production plants for the separation of deuterium from the other isotopes of hydrogen until such time as the Party wishing to receive the information shall determine that the construction of such plants is required; the Commission will, however, supply the Authority with heavy water as provided in Article III A and Article IV;

(c) the exchange of restricted data pertaining to design, construction, and operation of production plants for the separation of isotopes of any other element, except as may be agreed;

(d) the exchange of restricted data pertaining to the underlying principles, theory, design, construction, and operation of facilities, other than reactors, capable of producing significant quantities of isotopes by means of nuclear reactions, except as may be agreed.

E. Health and Safety

The entire field of health and safety as related to any of the fields within which information is to be exchanged in accordance with the provisions of this Article; in addition those problems of health and safety which affect the individual, his environment, and the civilian population as a whole and which arise from nuclear explosion (excluding such test data as would permit the determination of the yield of any specific weapon or nuclear device and excluding any information relating to the design or fabrication of any weapon or nuclear device).

ARTICLE III

Research materials and research facilities

A. Research Materials

Materials of interest in connection with any subject of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article II subject to the provisions of Article I, including source material, special nuclear material, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes shall, except as provided in paragraph E of Article I, be exchanged for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially to the Party wishing to receive them.

B. Research Facilities

Under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, specialized research facilities and reactor testing facilities shall be made available for mutual use consistent with the limits of space, facilities, and personnel conveniently available, except that it is understood that neither Party will be able to permit access by personnel of the other Party to facilities which are primarily of military significance.

ARTICLE IV

Materials for purposes other than research

In connection with any subject of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article II subject to the provisions of Article I, specific arrangements may be agreed between the Parties from time to time for the sale and purchase, under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, of quantities, greater than those required for research, of materials other than special nuclear materials.

ARTICLE V

Transfer of equipment and devices

With respect to any subject of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article II subject to the provisions of Article I, equipment and devices may be transferred from one Party to the other under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, except as provided in paragraph E of Article I. It is recognized that such transfers will be subject to limitations which may arise from shortages of supplies or other circumstances existing at the time.

ARTICLE VI

Permissive arrangements for materials, including equipment and devices, and services

A. Within the fields specified in paragraph B of this Article, persons under the

jurisdiction of one Party shall be permitted to make arrangements to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices and rights owned by them therein, to and perform services for the other Party and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by it to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, provided that any classified information the disclosure of which would be involved shall fall within the fields specified in paragraph B and subject to:

(1) the provisions of paragraph E of Article I;

(2) applicable laws, regulations and license requirements;

(3) approval of the Party to the jurisdiction of which the person making the arrangement is subject if the materials or services are classified or if the furnishing of such materials or services requires the communication of classified information.

B. To the extent necessary in carrying out the arrangements made under paragraph A of this Article, classified information in the following fields, subject in each case to the provisions of Article I, may be communicated by the person furnishing the material or services to the Party or person to whom such material or service is furnished:

(1) the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article II;

(2) the development, design, construction, operation, and use of research, experimental power, demonstration power, and power reactors;

(3) the development, design, manufacture, and use of equipment and devices of use in connection with the fields described in this paragraph.

ARTICLE VII

Patents

A. With respect to any invention or discovery employing information which has been communicated under this Agreement by one of the Parties to the other in accordance with Article II and made or conceived thereafter but during the period of this Agreement, and in which invention or discovery rights are owned by the Government of the United States or by the Government of the United Kingdom or any agency or corporation owned or controlled by either, each Party:

(1) agrees to transfer and assign to the other Party all right, title, and interest in and to any such invention, discovery, patent application or patent in the country of that other Party, to the extent owned, subject to a royalty-free, non-exclusive, irrevocable license for the governmental purposes of such other Party and for purposes of mutual defense;

(2) shall retain all right, title, and interest in and to any such invention, discovery, patent application or patent in its own or third countries but shall, upon request of the other Party, grant to that other party a royalty-free, nonexclusive, irrevocable license for the governmental purposes of such other Party in such countries, including use in the production of materials in such countries for sale to the other Party by a contractor of such other Party; each Party may deal with any such invention, discovery, patent application or patent in its own country and all countries other than that of the other Party as it may desire, but in no event shall either Party discriminate against citizens of the country of the other Party in respect of granting any license under the patents owned by it in its own or any other country;

(3) waives any and all claims against the other Party for compensation, royalty or award as respects any such invention or discovery, patent application or patent and releases the other Party with respect to any such claim.

B. (1) No patent application with respect to any classified invention or discovery employing information which has been communicated under this Agreement may be filed by either Party or any person in the country of the other Party except in accordance with agreed conditions and procedures.

(2) No patent application with respect to any such classified invention or discovery may be filed in any country not a party to this Agreement except as may be agreed and subject to Article IX.

(3) Appropriate secrecy or prohibition orders shall be issued for the purpose of giving effect to this paragraph.

ARTICLE VIII

Classification policies

Agreed classification policies shall be maintained with respect to all information, materials, equipment and devices exchanged under this Agreement. The Parties intend to continue the present practice of consultation with each other on the classification of these matters.

ARTICLE IX

Guaranties

The Parties guarantee that:

A. All classified material, equipment, devices and classified information exchanged under this Agreement shall be safeguarded in accordance with the applicable security arrangements between the Commission and the Authority.

B. No material, equipment or device transferred pursuant to this Agreement shall be used for atomic weapons or for research on or development of atomic weapons, or for any other military purpose.

C. No material, equipment, device, or restricted data transferred pursuant to this Agreement, and no equipment or device which would disclose any restricted data transferred pursuant to this Agreement, shall be transferred to any unauthorized person or beyond the jurisdiction of the country receiving it, without the written consent of the Party to this Agreement from which or by permission of which it was received. Such consent will not be given on behalf of the Government of the United States unless the transfer in respect of which it is requested is within the scope of an agreement for cooperation made in accordance with Section 123 of the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

ARTICLE X

Definitions

For the purposes of this agreement:

"Atomic weapon" means any device utilizing atomic energy, exclusive of the means for transporting or propelling the device (where such means is a separable and divisible part of the device), the principal purpose of which is for use as, or for development of, a weapon, a weapon prototype, or a weapon test device.

"The Authority" means the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority.

"Byproduct material" means any radioactive material (except special nuclear material) yielded in or made radioactive by exposure to the radiation incident to the process of producing or utilizing special nuclear material.

"Classified" means a security designation of "Confidential" or higher applied under the laws and regulations of either the United Kingdom or the United States to any data, information, materials, services or any other matter, and includes "restricted data."

"The Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

"Equipment and devices" and "equipment or device" means any instrument, apparatus, or facility and includes any facility, except an atomic weapon, capable of making use of or producing special nuclear material, and component parts thereof.

"Person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, group, government agency or government corporation other than the Commission and the Authority.

"Pilot plant" means a device operated to acquire specific data for the design of a full-scale plant and which utilizes the process, or a portion thereof, and the type of equipment which would be used in the full-scale production plant.

"Reactor" means an apparatus other than an atomic weapon, in which a self-supporting fission chain reaction is maintained by utilizing uranium, plutonium, or thorium or any combination of uranium, plutonium, or thorium.

"Restricted data" means all data concerning (1) design, manufacture, or utilization of atomic weapons; (2) the production of special nuclear material; or (3) the use of special nuclear material in the production of energy, but shall not include data declassified or removed from the category of restricted data by the appropriate authority.

"Special nuclear material" means (1) plutonium, uranium enriched in the isotope 233 or in the isotope 235, and any other material which the Commission or the Authority determines to be special nuclear material; or (2) any material artifically enriched by any of the foregoing.

ARTICLE XI

Period of agreement

This agreement shall enter into force on the date on which each government shall receive from the other government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement and shall remain in force for a period of 10 years.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this agreement.

Done at Washington this 15th day of June, 1955, in two original texts.

For the Government of the United States of America:

ROBERT MURPHY.
LEWIS STRAUSS.

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

R. H. SCOTT.

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the attached Agreement for Cooperation on the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the United States of America, and authorize its execution by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

As you know, Great Britain has from the beginning been one of the leaders in the development of atomic energy. Her scientists include great names in nuclear research, and her research and experimental centers are among the finest and most advanced in the world. British endeavor in the field of atomic energy preceded World War II, but in 1943 all work in this field was suspended in the British Isles, and the leading English scientists came to the United States and to Canada to labor jointly with the scientists of those countries in the development of the atomic bomb. The immense contribution made by the United Kingdom in the great scientific achievement which resulted is a matter of recorded history. Since the war, the United Kingdom has developed and put into effect an impressive, comprehensive, and highly integrated atomic energy program; but collaboration and the exchange of

atomic energy information between our two Governments was, until the passage of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, severely limited by law. The proposed agreement, negotiated under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, represents an important step toward achieving in the field of the peaceful uses of atomic energy the friendly tradition of cooperation which prevails in the other areas of our relationships with Her Majesty's Government and will result in mutual benefit.

The agreement calls for reciprocal assistance in the achievement of the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, for the exchange of information between the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority of classified and unclassified information relating to the application of atomic energy for peaceful uses (including such general information on design and characteristics of various types of reactors as is required to permit evaluation and comparison of their potential use in a power-production program), for an exchange of research materials not available commercially, for the use of research and reactor testing facilities, and for the transfer of equipment and devices. However, of the information which is classified, only that relevant to current or projective programs will be exchanged. The parties to the agreement will not exchange restricted data under the agreement which is primarily of military significance nor will they grant access to facilities which are primarily of military significance. Further it is specifically provided that the parties will not transport or export, or permit the transfer or export, under the agreement of any material, equipment, or device which is primarily of a military character; and, further, that the disposition and utilization of atomic weapons and the exchange of restricted data relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons shall be outside the scope of the agreement.

Special nuclear material will be exchanged under the agreement only for research purposes and in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, subject to the general limitation that no material which is primarily of a military character will be transferred.

The reciprocal arrangement set forth in the proposed agreement will permit the scientists and technicians of the United States access to valuable atomic information developed in the United Kingdom and will make possible a close collaboration in investigating the effective peacetime uses of atomic energy and in advancing the frontiers of knowledge in the nuclear sciences. The limits of nuclear energy cannot now be predicted, but its promise for the more abundant life is infinate. Working together the scientists of these two great nations can contribute substantially to the fulfillment of that promise. In this way, each Government will be promiting its own defense and security and substantially furthering the mutual security of the peoples of the free world.

It is, therefore, the opinion of the Commission agreement not only is in accordance with the policy which you have established concerning the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in collaboration with friendly foreign nations, but also that the cooperative effort which the proposed agreement will permit will further solidify the friendship we now enjoy with Her Majesty's Government and go far in assuring the continuance of peace and freedom in our countries.

Respectfully,

L. L. STRAUSS,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 15, 1955.

Hon. L. L. STRAUSS,
Chairman.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of June 15, 1955, the Atomic Energy Commission recommended that I approve a proposed agreement for cooperation concerning the civil uses of atomic energy by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the United States of America.

The Commission's letter of recommendation refers to the close collaboration that existed between Great Britain and the United States in the development of the atomic bomb, and points out that since the war and until the passage of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, further cooperation in atomic energy development was severely limited by law. The Commission's letter also states that the United Kingdom has developed and put into effect a comprehensive atomic energy program, and that the proposed agreement, negotiated under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, represents an important step toward achieving in the atomic energy field the friendly tradition of cooperation which prevails in the other areas of our relationships with Her Majesty's Government.

I have examined the agreement recommended. I share in the belief of the Commission that the performance of the agreement will result in mutual benefit to both Governments.

The agreement calls for an exchange of classified and unclassified information relating to the application of atomic energy for peaceful uses, for an exchange of research materials not available commercially, for the use of research and reactor testing facilities, and for the transfer of equipment and devices. It is provided, however, that classified information will be exchanged only when relevant to current or projected programs, and that the parties to the agreement will not exchange restricted data under the agreement which is primarily of military significance; nor will they grant access to facilities which are primarily of military significance. Further, it is specifically provided that the parties will not transfer or export, or permit the transfer or export, under the agreement, of any material, equipment, or device which is primarily of a military significance. It is specifically provided that the disposition and utilization of atomic weapons and the exchange of restricted data relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons shall be outside the scope of the agreement.

Special nuclear material will be exchanged under the agreement only for research purposes and in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, subject to the general limitation that nuclear material which is primarily of a military character will not be transferred.

The extent of the progress of atomic energy development in Great Britain, particularly in the matter of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, makes it certain that the United States will gain materially from a mutual exchange of information and the mutual uses of facilities. The proposed agreement will permit our scientists to have access to valuable information which the eminent scientists of the United Kingdom have developed, and will make possible a close collaboration in advancing the frontiers of knowledge in the nuclear sciences and the fulfillment of the promise which nuclear energy holds for all mankind. I share the opinion of the Commission that the activities called for in the agreement will promote the defense and security of the United States and will substantially further the mutual security of the peoples of the free world.

Accordingly, pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby

(1) Approve the within proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland concerning the civil uses of atomic energy;

(2) Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States; and

(3) Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT EISENHOWER.

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1955.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy,
Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123 (c) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 there is submitted with this letter:

(1) A proposed agreement for cooperation with the Government of the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland;

(2) A letter dated June 15, 1955, from the Commission to the President recommending his approval of the proposed agreement;

(3) A letter dated June 15, 1955, from the President to the Commission approving the proposed agreement, authorizing its execution, and containing his determination that the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

This proposed agreement for cooperation calls for the exchange of classified and unclassified information and material, including restricted data, and is more extensive in scope than the unclassified research agreements which previously have been submitted to this session of the Congress.

The arrangement contained in the proposed agreement results from the special relationship which exists between the Government of the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland and the United States in the atomic energy field.

Sincerely yours,

L. L. STRAUSS,
Chairman.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA

The Government of the United States of America, represented by the United States Atomic Energy Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), and the Government of Canada, through its wholly-owned Corporations, Eldorado Mining and Refining Limited and Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, have for several years been engaged in atomic energy programs within their respective countries and from the inception of these programs have collaborated closely in certain areas. The principal objective of Canada's atomic energy program is the civil use of atomic energy and, in particular, the use of atomic energy as a source of electric energy. The objective of the atomic energy program in the United States is twofold: (1) the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, and (2) the use of atomic energy for defense purposes. There exists a unique tradition of cooperation between Canada and the United States. Based on similar national interests, this cooperation produces special industrial and economic interrelationships. Consequently, progress in each country toward the full benefits of the peaceful uses of atomic energy will be accelerated through an arrangement which is consistent with the cooperation existing in other areas. Accordingly, the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, the parties to this Agreement, agree, as provided herein, to assist each other in the achievement of the objectives of their respective atomic energy

programs to the extent such assistance is relevant to current or projected programs and subject to applicable laws of the respective governments and the availability of material and personnel. While for the present and for the foreseeable future priority of materials and personnel must be given to defense needs, an increasing number of opportunities exist for the development of the peaceful applications of atomic energy. It is expressly understood that the design, fabrication, disposition, or utilization of atomic weapons are outside the scope of this Agreement.

ARTICLE I—PERIOD OF AGREEMENT

This Agreement shall enter into force on the date of receipt by the Government of Canada of a notification from the Government of the United States of America that the period of thirty days required by Section 123c of the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954 has elapsed, and it shall remain in force through July 31, 1965.

ARTICLE II—EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION

Classified and unclassified information will be exchanged between the Commission and the appropriate agencies of the Government of Canada with respect to the application of atomic energy to peaceful uses, including research and development relating thereto, and including problems of health and safety. There are set forth in this Article the specific fields in which classified information will be exchanged. The exchange of information provided for in this Article will be accomplished through the various means available, including reports, conferences, and visits to facilities.

A. Limitations

Of the information which is classified, only that relevant to current or projected programs will be exchanged. The parties to the Agreement will not exchange Restricted Data under this Agreement which, in the opinion of either country, is primarily of military significance, or exchange Restricted Data relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons. Within the subject matter of this Agreement, the parties may come into possession of privately developed and privately owned information and information received from other governments which the parties are not permitted to exchange.

It is mutually understood and agreed that, except as limitations are stated to apply specifically to one party or the other, any limitations to cooperation imposed pursuant to this Agreement shall be reciprocal.

B. Reactors

(1) Information on the development, design, construction, operation and use of research, production, experimental power, demonstration power, and power reactors, except as provided in Paragraph A and (2) and (3) of this paragraph.

(2) The development of submarine, ship, aircraft, and certain package power reactors is presently concerned primarily with their military uses. Accordingly, it is agreed that the parties to this Agreement will not communicate to each other under this Agreement Restricted Data pertaining primarily to such reactors, until such time as these types of reactors warrant civil application, and as the exchange of information on these types of reactors may be mutually agreed. Restricted Data pertaining to the adaptation of these types of reactors to military use, however, will not be exchanged under this Agreement. Likewise, the parties to the Agreement will not exchange under this Agreement Restricted Data pertaining primarily to any future reactor-types the development of which may be concerned primarily with their military use, until such time as these types of reactors warrant civil application and as exchange of information on these types of reactors may be mutually agreed; and Restricted Data pertaining to the adaptation of these types of reactors to military use will not be exchanged under this Agreement. Nevertheless, information pertaining to military nuclear power plants in furtherance of the joint Canada-United States defense effort in the development of an early-warning radar network may be exchanged.

(3) It is agreed that neither of the parties to this Agreement will exchange Restricted Data on any specific production, experimental power, demonstration power, and power reactor, unless that type of reactor is being operated currently by the other party, or is being considered seriously for construction by the other party as a source of power or as an intermediate step in a power production program. There will, however, be exchanged such general information on design and characteristics of various types of reactors as is required to permit evaluation and comparison of their potential use in a power production program.

C. Source materials

Geology, exploration techniques, chemistry and technology of extracting uranium and thorium from their ores and concentrates, the chemistry, production technology, and techniques of purification and fabrication of uranium and thorium compounds and metals, including design, construction and operation of plants, except as provided in Paragraph A.

D. Materials

(1) Physical, chemical and nuclear properties of all elements, compounds, alloys, mixtures, special nuclear materials, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes and their behavior under various conditions, except as provided in Paragraph A.

(2) Technology of production and utilization, from laboratory experimentation and theory of production up to pilot plant operations (but not including design and operation of pilot plants and full scale plants, except as may be agreed), of all elements, compounds, alloys, mixtures, special nuclear material, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes, relevant to and subject to the limitations of Paragraphs B, E, and F of this Article, except as provided in Paragraph A and (a), (b), (c) and (d) of this subparagraph.

(a) The Commission will not communicate Restricted Data pertaining to design, construction and operation of production plants for the separation of U–235 from other uranium isotopes. The Commission, however, will supply the Government of Canada with uranium enriched in U–235 as provided in Article III A and Article VI.

(b) The Commission will not communicate Restricted Data on the design, construction and operation of specific production plants for the separation of deuterium from the other isotopes of hydrogen until such time as the Government of Canada shall determine that the construction of such plants is required. The Commission will, however, supply the Government of Canada with heavy water as provided in Article III A and Article VI.

(c) No Restricted Data will be exchanged pertaining to the design, construction and operation of production plants for the separation of isotopes of any other element, except as may be agreed.

(d) No Restricted Data will be exchanged pertaining to the underlying principles, theory, design, construction and operation of facilities, other than reactors, capable of producing significant quantities of isotopes by means of nuclear reactions, except as may be agreed.

E. Health and safety

The entire field of health and safety as related to this Article. In addition, those problems of health and safety which affect the individual, his environment, and the civilian population as a whole and which arise from nuclear explosion (excluding such tests data as would permit the determination of the yield of any specific weapon or nuclear device and excluding any information relating to the design or fabrication of any weapon or nuclear device), and except as provided in Paragraph A.

F. Instruments, instrumentation and devices

Development, design, manufacture, and use of equipment and devices of use in connection with the subjects of agreed exchange of information provided in this Article, except as provided in Paragraph A.

ARTICLE III—RESEARCH MATERIALS AND RESEARCH FACILITIES

A. Research materials

Materials of interest in connection with the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article II, and under the limitations set forth therein, including source materials, special nuclear material, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes, will be exchanged for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, except as provided in Article VII, when such materials are not available commercially. These materials for nonresearch purposes may be supplied by one party of this Agreement to the other as provided in Article VI.

B. Research facilities

Under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, and to the extent as may be agreed, specialized research facilities and reactor testing facilities will be made available for mutual use consistent with the limits of space, facilities and personnel conveniently available, except that it is understood that the Commission will not be able to permit access by Canadian personnel to facilities which, in the opinion of the Commission, are primarily of military significance.

ARTICLE IV—TRANSFER OF EQUIPMENT AND DEVICES

With respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article II, and under the limitations set forth therein, equipment and devices may be transferred from one party to the other to the extent and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, except as provided in Article VII. It is recognized that such transfers will be subject to limitations which may arise from shortages of supplies or other circumstances existing at the time.

ARTICLE V—OTHER ARRANGEMENTS FOR MATERIALS, INCLUDING EQUIPMENT AND DEVICES AND SERVICES

It is contemplated that, as provided in this Article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or Canada may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other country. Accordingly, with respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article II, and under the limitations set forth therein, persons under the jurisdiction of either the Government of the United States of America or the Government of Canada will be permitted to make arrangements to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, to and perform services for the other government and such persons under the jurisdiction of the other government as are authorized by the other government to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, subject to:

(a) The limitation in Article VII.

(b) Applicable laws, regulations and license requirements of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada.

(c) The approval of the government to which the person is subject when the materials or services are classified or when the

furnishing of such materials and services requires the communication of classified information.

ARTICLE VI—NONRESEARCH QUANTITIES OF MATERIALS

A. The Commission will sell to Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, a wholly-owned corporation of the Government of Canada, under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, such quantities of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 as may be required in the power reactor program in Canada during this period, subject to any limitations in connection with the quantities of such material available for such distribution by the Commission during any year, and subject to the limitation that the quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 of weapon quality in the possession of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited by reason of transfer under this Agreement shall not, in the opinion of the Commission, be of military significance. It is agreed that the uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 which the Commission will sell to Atomic Energy of Canada Limited under this Article will be limited to uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235. It is understood and agreed that, although Atomic Energy of Canada Limited intends to distribute uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 to authorized users in Canada, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited will retain title to any uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 which is purchased from the Commission until such time as private users in the United States are permitted to acquire title to uranium enriched in the isotope U–235.

The Government of Canada, or its appropriate agent, will give to the Commission a first refusal of any special nuclear materials which the Government of Canada may desire to transfer outside of Canada, where such special nuclear materials have been produced from the irradiation of fuel elements enriched with U–235 purchased from the Commission under the terms of this Agreement.

In addition, any special nuclear material transferred by Atomic Energy of Canada Limited to the United States may be retransferred to Canada on such terms and conditions as may be agreed.

B. The Commission will continue the present understanding with Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, wholly-owned corporation of the Government of Canada, covering the sale of uranium of normal isotopic composition for use in the NRX and NRU reactors.

The Commission will also sell to Atomic Energy of Canada Limited such quantities of uranium of normal isotopic composition, and to the extent practical in such form, as may be required for the power reactor program in Canada and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, subject to the availability of supply and the needs of the United States program.

C. The Commission will continue the present understanding with Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, a wholly-owned corporation of the Government of Canada, covering the sale of heavy water for use in the NRX and NRU reactors. The Commission will also sell to Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, such quantities of heavy water as may be required in the power reactor program in Canada, subject to the availability of supply and the needs of the United States program.

D. It is understood and agreed that the existing contract between the Commission and Atomic Energy of Canada Limited relating to the sale of plutonium, and extensions thereof, will continue in full force and effect.

E. Collaboration between the two countries in the field of raw materials has resulted in the development of substantial uranium production in Canada which has been made available to the United States under arrangements and contracts now in effect. These arrangements and contracts shall remain in full force and effect except as modified or revised by mutual agreement.

F. As may be necessary and as mutually agreed in connection with the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article II, and under the limitations set forth therein, specific arrangements may be made from time to time between the parties for lease or sale and purchase of nonresearch quantities of other materials under such terms and conditions as may be mutually agreed, except as provided in Article VII.

ARTICLE VII—MATERIALS AND FACILITIES PRIMARILY OF MILITARY SIGNIFICANCE

The Commission will not transfer any materials under Article III A or Article VI F and will not transfer or permit the export of any materials or equipment and devices under Article IV and Article V if such materials or equipment and devices are in the opinion of the Commission primarily of military significance.

ARTICLE VIII—CLASSIFICATION POLICIES

The Governments of the United States of America and Canada agree that mutually agreed classification policies shall be maintained with respect to all information and materials, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this Agreement. In addition, the parties intend to continue the present practice of periodic consultation with each other on the classification of atomic energy information.

ARTICLE IX—PATENTS

A. With respect to any invention or discovery employing information which has been communicated hereunder and made or conceived thereafter during the period of this Agreement, and in which invention or discovery rights are owned by the Government of the United States or by the Government of Canada or an agency or corporation owned or controlled by either, each party:

(1) Agrees to transfer and assign to the other all right, title, and interest in and to any such invention, discovery, patent application or patent in the country of the other, to the extent owned, subject to a royalty-free, nonexclusive, irrevocable license for its own governmental purposes and for purposes of mutual defense.

(2) Shall retain all right, title, and interest in and to any such invention, discovery, patent application or patent in its own or third countries but will, upon request of the other party, grant to the other party a royalty-free, nonexclusive, irrevocable license for its own governmental purposes in such countries including use in the production of materials in such countries for sale to the other party by a contractor of such other party. Each party may deal with any such invention, discovery, patent application or patent in its own country and all countries other than that of the other party as it may desire, but in no event shall either party discriminate against citizens of the other country in respect of granting any license under the patents owned by it in its own or any other country.

(3) Waives any and all claims against the other party for compensation, royalty or award as respects any such invention or discovery, patent application or patent and releases the other party with respect to any such claim.

B. (1) No patent application with respect to any classified invention or discovery made or conceived during the period of this Agreement in connection with subject matter communicated hereunder may be filed by either party except in accordance with mutually agreed upon conditions and procedure.

(2) No patent application with respect to any such classified invention or discovery may be filed in any country not a party to this Agreement except as may be mutually agreed and subject to Article X.

(3) Appropriate secrecy or prohibition orders will be issued for the purpose of effectuating this provision.

ARTICLE X—SECURITY

A. The Governments of the United States of America and Canada have adopted similar security safeguards and standards in connection with their respective atomic energy programs. The two governments agree that all classified information and material, including equipment and devices, within the scope of this Agreement, will be safeguarded in accordance with the security safeguards and standards prescribed by the security arrangement between the Commission and the Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada in effect on June 15, 1955.

B. It is agreed that the recipient party of any material, including equipment and devices, and of any classified information under this Agreement, shall not further disseminate such information, or transfer such material, including equipment and devices, to any other country without the written consent of the originating country. It is further agreed that neither party to this Agreement will transfer to any other country any equipment or device, the transfer of which would involve the disclosure of any classified information received from the other party, without the written consent of such other party.

ARTICLE XI—GUARANTIES PRESCRIBED BY THE UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

The Government of Canada guarantees that:

A. The security safeguards and standards prescribed by the security arrangements between the Commission and the Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada in effect on June 15, 1955, will be maintained with respect to all classified information and materials, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this Agreement.

B. No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of Canada or authorized persons under its jurisdiction by purchase or otherwise pursuant to this Agreement will be used for atomic weapons, or for research on or development of atomic weapons, or for any other military purpose.

C. No material, including equipment and devices, or any Restricted Data transferred to the Government of Canada or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this Agreement will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of Canada, except as the Commission may agree to such a transfer to another nation, and then only if the transfer of the material or Restricted Data is within the scope of an Agreement for Cooperation between the United States and the other nation.

ARTICLE XII—GUARANTIES BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Government of the United States of America guarantees that:

A. The security safeguards and standards prescribed by the security arrangements between the Commission and the Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada in effect on June 15, 1955 will be maintained with respect to all classified information and materials, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this Agreement.

B. No material, including equipment and devices, or any Restricted Data transferred to the Government of the United States or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this Agreement, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of the United States of America, except as the Government of Canada may agree to such a transfer to another nation.

ARTICLE XIII—STATEMENT CONCERNING CONSTRUCTION OF ARTICLE II A AND B (2) AND ARTICLE XI B

Article II A and B (2) and Article XI B shall not be construed to prevent the Government of Canada from selling materials produced in its reactors to the Government of the United States for defense use or from making available, to the extent the Government of Canada may agree to do so, its reactor testing facilities for use by the Government of the United States in connection with the defense aspects of atomic energy.

ARTICLE XIV—DEFINITIONS

For purposes of this agreement:

A. "Classified" means a security designation of "Confidential" or higher applied under the laws and regulations of either Canada or the United States to any data, information, materials, services or any other matter, and includes "Restricted Data."

B. "Equipment and devices" means any instrument, apparatus or facility, and includes production facilities and utilization facilities and component parts thereof.

C. "Person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, group, government agency or government corporation, but does not include the parties of this agreement.

D. "Pilot Plant" means a device operated to acquire specific data for the design of a full-scale plant and which utilizes the process, or a portion thereof, and the type of equipment which would be used in a full-scale production plant.

E. "Reactor" means an apparatus, other than an atomic weapon, in which a self-supporting fission chain reaction is maintained by utilizing uranium, plutonium, or thorium, or any combination of uranium, plutonium, or thorium.

F. The terms "production facilities," "utilization facilities," "source materials," "special nuclear materials," "byproduct material," "Restricted Data," and "atomic weapon" are used in this agreement as defined in the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

In witness whereof, the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at Washington in duplicate this 15th day of June, 1955.

For the Government of the United States of America:

ROBERT MURPHY.
LEWIS L. STRAUSS.

For the Government of Canada:

A. D. P. HEENEY.
W. J. BENNETT.

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 14, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the attached Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and authorize its execution by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

As you know, Canada and the United States were active partners in the wartime undertaking that resulted in the first release of atomic energy by man, and during World War II the collaboration between the two countries was close and invaluable. Since then, however, and until the passage of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, United States participation in a cooperative effort to advance the peaceful uses of atomic energy was severely limited by law. Canada, on the other hand, in continuing to pursue an active atomic energy program for peaceful purposes, has closely cooperated with the United States in certain important areas and in a way which has made a valuable contribution to our common defense and security.

Beyond the field of atomic energy, there exists, as the proposed agreement recites, a unique tradition of friendship and cooperation between Canada and the United States. Based on similar national interests and ideals, this tradition has produced special industrial, economic, and cultural relationships which have contributed to our common security and well-being. As you stated in your address to the House of Commons at Ottawa in November 1953, the sense of partnership that for generations has been the hallmark of the relations between Canada and the United States has made each country "a better and stronger and more influential nation because each can rely upon every resource of the other in days of crisis. Beyond this, each can work and grow and prosper with the other through years of quiet peace." The proposed document represents an important step toward achieving in the field of the peaceful uses of atomic energy that sense of partnership which prevails in the other areas of our relationship with Canada, and will materially assist both the United States and Canada in the achievement of the objectives of their respective atomic energy programs.

The agreement calls for an exchange of classified and unclassified information relating to the application of atomic energy to peaceful uses, for an exchange of research materials not available commercially, for the use of research and testing facilities, and for the transfer of equipment and devices. However, of the information which is classified, only that relevant to the current or projected programs will be exchanged; and the parties to the agreement will not exchange Restricted Data under the agreement which, in the opinion of either country, is primarily of military significance or which relates to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons. Further, it is provided that the Commission will not transfer materials or equipment and devices which in its opinion are primarily of military significance, nor will it grant access to research and testing facilities which are primarily of military significance.

It is provided in the proposed agreement that the Commission will sell to Atomic Energy of Canada, Ltd. (a wholly owned corporation of the government of Canada) such quantities of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 as may be required in the power reactor program in Canada during the period of the agreement, subject to the availability of this material for such distribution and to the limitation that the quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 of weapon quality in the possession of Atomic Energy of Canada, Ltd., by reason of transfer under the agreement shall not be of military significance, as determined by the Commission. Enriched uranium to be sold under the agreement will be limited to uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235. The Government of Canada, on its part, will give to the Commission a first refusal of any special nuclear materials which it may desire to transfer outside of Canada, where such materials have been produced from the irradiation of fuel elements enriched with U–235 purchased from the Commission. The agreement also provides for continued collaboration between the two countries in the field of raw materials which already has resulted in the development of substantial uranium production in Canada which has been made available to the United States. Under the agreement, it will also be possible for the Commission to continue its use of Canadian reactors for special and unique irradiations of value in the Commission's weapons program. A still further benefit to the United States under the agreement will result from the strengthening of our domestic economy through the authorization granted United States industry to enter into commercial arrangements in the atomic energy field with the Government of Canada and its authorized nationals.

It is the opinion of the Commission that the proposed agreement is an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy both in the United States and in Canada, in accordance with the policy which you have established. It is the further opinion of the Commission that the cooperative effort which the proposed agreement will permit will further solidify the friendship we now enjoy and go far in assuring the continuance of peace and freedom in our countries.

Respectfully yours,

L. L. STRAUSS,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 15, 1955.

The Honorable LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of June 15, 1955, the Atomic Energy Commission recommended that I approve a proposed agreement for cooperation concerning the civil uses of atomic energy between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States of America.

The Commission's letter of recommendation refers to the history of collaboration in the field of atomic energy between Canada and the United States, and points out that, while United States participation in a cooperative effort to advance the peaceful uses of atomic energy was, until the passage of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, severely limited by law, Canada has continued to cooperate closely with the United States in certain important areas and in a way which has contributed to our common defense and security. The Commission's letter also points out, and the proposed agreement so recites, that there exists in other areas a unique tradition of friendship and cooperation between Canada and the United States which has contributed to the security and well-being of both countries.

I have examined the agreement recommended. I share wholeheartedly in the belief of the Commission that the proposed document represents an important step in achieving in the field of the peaceful uses of atomic energy that sense of partnership which prevails in the other areas of our relationships with Canada, and will materially assist both the United States and Canada in the achievement of the objectives of their respective atomic-energy programs, thus solidifying further the friendship we now enjoy and contributing to the preservation of peace and freedom in other countries.

The proposed agreement calls for an exchange of classified and unclassified information relating to the application of atomic energy to peaceful uses, for an exchange of research materials not available commercially, for the use of research and testing facilities and for the transfer of equipment and devices. It is also provided that the Commission will sell special nuclear material to Atomic Energy, Ltd., of Canada in such quantities as may be required in the Canadian power-reactor program during the term of the agreement.

However, the parties to the agreement will not exchange restricted data under the agreement which, in the opinion of either country, is primarily of military significance or which relates to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons. Nor will the Commission transfer materials or equipment and devices which,

in its opinion, are primarily of military significance, or grant access to research and testing facilities which are primarily of military significance. With respect to the sale of special nuclear material, it is noted that such sale is subject to the limitation that the quantity of this material which would be transferred to Canada shall not be of military significance, as determined by the Commission.

By reason of the state of the art in Canada, the United States will gain materially from the mutual exchange of information and the mutual use of facilities. Further benefits to this country under the agreement will be realized from the first refusal given by Canada to the United States with respect to special nuclear material produced in Canada from the irradiation of fuel elements enriched with U-235 purchased from the Commission, from continued collaboration in the important field of raw materials, from the continued use of Canadian reactors for special irradiations of value in the Commission's weapons program, and from the general strengthening of our domestic economy which will result from the development of commercial activities between the two countries and their nationals in the field of atomic energy.

Accordingly, pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby

(1) Approve the within proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada concerning the civil uses of atomic energy.

(2) Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States, and

(3) Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for cooperation for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT EISENHOWER.

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1955.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123 (c) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

(1) A proposed Agreement for Cooperation with the Government of Canada;

(2) A letter, dated June 14, 1955, from the Commission to the President recommending his approval of the proposed agreement;

(3) A letter, dated June 15, 1955, from the President to the Commission approving the proposed agreement, authorizing its execution, and containing his determination that the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

This proposed Agreement for Cooperation calls for the exchange of classified and unclassified information and material, including Restricted Data, and is more extensive in scope than the unclassified research agreements which previously have been submitted to this session of the Congress.

The arrangement contained in the proposed agreements results from the special relationship which exists between Canada and the United States in the atomic energy field.

Sincerely yours,

L. L. STRAUSS,
Chairman.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION CONCERNING THE CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF BELGIUM

Beginning with discussions in 1940 the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Belgium have cooperated with each other in the atomic energy field.

As a result of these discussions, the Belgian Government and the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom reached a common understanding as to the desirability during World War II, as well as in the future, that all uranium ores wherever located should be subject to effective control for the protection of civilization. To this end, the Government of Belgium undertook to insure effective control of such ores located in all territory subject to its authority.

The Belgian Government has also made available Congo uranium ores to the United States and the United Kingdom through commercial contracts. The Belgian Government further undertook to use its best endeavors to supply such quantities of uranium ores as might be required by the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom.

The arrangements outlined above were on the understanding that Belgium would reserve for itself such quantities of uranium ores as might be required for its own scientific and industrial purposes. The Belgian Government, however, in deciding to utilize such ores as a source of energy for commercial power would do so in consultation and in agreement with the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom. The latter on their part, agreed that the Belgian Government should participate on equitable terms in the utilization of these ores as a source of energy for commercial power at such time as the two Governments should decide to employ the ores for this purpose.

Since that time the Government of Belgium has made available to the United States and to the United Kingdom, through commercial contracts, a vitally important quantity of uranium produced in the Belgian Congo and thus has made a unique contribution to the defense of the western world. The United States and the United Kingdom have assisted in the development of the Congo uranium properties and have assisted the Government of Belgium in the establishment of a research and development program the principal objective of which is the realization of the peaceful use of atomic energy. Consequently a special relationship exists between the Government of the United States and the Government of Belgium in the field of atomic energy. While the United States must continue to give priority to the defense aspects of atomic energy, an increasing number of opportunities exist for the development of its peaceful applications. In keeping, therefore, with the special relationship, the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Belgium, the Parties to this Agreement, desire to establish an expanded program of cooperation and have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

It is the intent of this Agreement that the Government of Belgium will receive from the United State Atomic Energy Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), in the field of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, information and materials on terms as favorable as any other major uranium supplying country except Canada.

ARTICLE II—PERIOD OF AGREEMENT

This Agreement shall enter into force on the date of receipt by the Government of Belgium of a notification from the Government of the United States of America that the period of thirty days required by Section 123c of the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954 has elapsed, and it shall remain in force through July 31, 1965. The Parties will reexamine the bases of this Agreement if world disarmament is realized or if a threat to world peace so requires.

ARTICLE III—EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION

A. With the objective of facilitating the development of peacetime uses of atomic energy, and particularly the development of atomic power, the Government of Belgium and the Commission agree to exchange the following information, subject to the limitations of paragraph C of this Article:

(1) General information on the over-all progress and economics of power reactor programs;

(2) Technological information required for the construction of specific reactors for the Belgian power program in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, and Ruanda-Urundi.

B. The exchange of information provided for in this Article includes the communication to the Commission of information developed in the Belgian power program and will be accomplished through the various means available, such as reports, conferences, and visits to facilities, and shall, subject to the limitations of paragraph C, include the following:

1. The Commission will transmit as needed in the Belgian project information relating to reactors which Belgium intends to construct as a part of its current experimental power and power program and which falls within one or the other of the following areas:

(a) Specifications for Reactor Materials: Final form specifications including composition, shape, size and special handling techniques of reactor materials including uranium, heavy water, pile grade graphite, zirconium.

(b) Properties of Reactor Materials: Physical, chemical, metallurgical, nuclear, and mechanical properties of reactor materials including fuel, moderator and coolant and the effects of the reactor's operating conditions on the properties of these materials.

(c) Reactor Components: The design and performance specifications of reactor components but not including the methods of production and fabrication.

(d) Reactor Physics Technology: This area includes theory of and pertinent data relating to neutron bombardment reactions, neutron cross sections, criticality calculations, reactor kinetics and shielding.

(e) Reactor Engineering Technology: This area includes considerations pertinent to the overall design and optimization of the reactor and theory and data relating to such problems as reactor stress and heat transfer analysis.

(f) Environmental Safety Considerations: This area includes considerations relating to normal reactor radiations and possible accidental hazards and the effect of these on equipment and personnel and appropriate methods of waste disposal and decontamination.

2. The Commission will receive selected security-cleared personnel from Belgium to work with and participate in the construction of the PWR reactor at Shippingport, Pennsylvania, and such other reactors as may be agreed.

3. The Commission will transmit to the Belgian Government all essential information as indicated in subparagraph B1 relating to the objective of making it possible for Belgium to design, construct, and operate a thermal, heterogeneous, pressurized light or heavy water (boiling or non-boiling) reactor if the decision is made on the part of the Belgian Government to construct such a reactor.

4. There will be collaboration with respect to unclassified reactor information and tech-

nology and with respect to unclassified information relating to the production of reactor materials such as heavy water, zirconium, and hafnium.

C. 1. The Parties will not exchange Restricted Data under this Agreement relating to design or fabrication of atomic weapons or information which, in the opinion of the Commission, is primarily of military significance; and no Restricted Data concerning the production of special nuclear materials will be exchanged except that concerning the incidental production of special nuclear materials in a power reactor. It is recognized that the Commission may come into possession of privately developed and privately owned information and information received from other governments which it is not permitted to exchange. It is also recognized that the Government of Belgium may come into possession of information developed and owned by private persons and industries not having access to information transmitted under this Agreement and information received from other governments which it is not permitted to exchange.

2. a. The Commission will communicate classified technical information required for the construction of any specific reactor only when Belgium is seriously considering the construction of the specific type of reactor in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, or Ruanda-Urundi and when private industry in the United States is permitted to undertake the construction and operation of the same type of reactor. In addition, the Commission will communicate classified information on any specific type of reactor other than those types mentioned in subparagraph B 3 only when, except as may otherwise be agreed, the Commission has made a finding that the specific type of reactor has been sufficiently developed to be of practical value for industrial or commercial purposes.

b. Further, the Commission will communicate classified information pertaining exclusively to any reactor-types, such as submarine, ship, aircraft, and certain package power reactors, the development of which is concerned primarily with their military use, only when, in the opinion of the Commission, these types of reactors warrant peacetime application and as exchange of information on these types of reactors may be mutually agreed.

ARTICLE IV—RESEARCH MATERIALS

Materials of interest in connection with the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article III, and under the limitations set forth therein, including source materials, special nuclear materials, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes will be exchanged for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, except as provided in Article VIII, when such materials are not available commercially. These materials for non-research purposes may be supplied by one Party to this Agreement to the other as provided in Article VII.

ARTICLE V—TRANSFER OF EQUIPMENT AND DEVICES

With respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article III, and under the limitations set forth therein, equipment and devices may be transferred from one party to the other under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, except as provided in Article VIII. It is recognized that such transfers will be subject to limitations which may arise from shortages of supplies or other circumstances existing at the time.

ARTICLE VI—OTHER ARRANGEMENTS FOR MATERIALS, INCLUDING EQUIPMENT AND DEVICES, AND SERVICES

It is contemplated that, as provided in this Article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or Belgium may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other country. Accordingly, with respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article II, and under the limitations set forth therein, persons under the jurisdiction of either the Government of the United States or the Government of Belgium will be permitted to make arrangements to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, to and perform services for the other Government and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by the other Government to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, subject to:

(a) The limitation in Article VIII;

(b) Applicable laws, regulations and license requirements of the Government of the United States and of the Government of Belgium;

(c) The approval of the Government to which the person is subject when the materials or services are classified or when the furnishing of such materials and services requires the communication of classified information.

ARTICLE VII—NON-RESEARCH QUANTITIES OF MATERIALS

A. 1. The Commission will sell to the Government of Belgium under such terms and conditions as may be agreed such quantities of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 as Belgium may require during the period of this Agreement for use in research and power reactors located in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, and Ruanda-Urundi, subject to any limitations in connection with quantities of such material available for such distribution by the Commission during any year, and subject to the limitation that the quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 of weapon quality in the possession of Belgium by reason of transfer under this Agreement shall not, in the opinion of the Commission, be of military significance. It is agreed that the uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 which the Commission will sell to Belgium under this Article will be limited to uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235. It is understood and agreed that although Belgium will distribute uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 to authorized users in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, and Ruanda-Urundi, the Government of Belgium will retain title to any uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 which is purchased from the Commission until such time as private users in the United States are permitted to acquire title to uranium enriched in the isotope U–235.

2. It is agreed that when any fuel elements received from the United States or any fuel elements fabricated from uranium of normal isotopic composition or uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 received from the United States require reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed by the Commission on terms and conditions to be later agreed; and it is understood, except as may be agreed, the form and content of the irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission for reprocessing.

B. The Commission will sell to Belgium under such terms and conditions as may be agreed such quantities of uranium of normal isotopic composition as Belgium may require, and to the extent practical in such form as Belgium may request, during the period of this Agreement for use in research and power reactors located in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, and Ruanda-Urundi, subject to the availability of supply and the needs of the United States program.

C. The Commission shall have an option to purchase any special nuclear materials produced in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, or Ruanda-Urundi, from materials sold in accordance with A and B of this Article and which are in excess of Belgium's need for such materials in its program for the peacetime use of atomic energy. Belgium agrees not to transfer to any country other than the United States or the United Kingdom any special nuclear materials produced in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, or Ruanda-Urundi unless the Government of Belgium is given assurance that the material will not be used for military purposes, and the Government of Belgium agrees to consult with the United States on the international significance of any proposed transfer of any uranium and thorium ores or special nuclear materials to any country other than the United Kingdom.

D. The Commission will sell to Belgium, under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, such quantities of heavy water as Belgium may require, during the period of this Agreement, for use in research and power reactors located in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, and Ruanda-Urundi, subject to the availability of supply and the needs of the United States program.

E. 1. It is agreed that existing commercial contracts between the Combined Development Agency and the African Metals Corporation, acting for the producing company (Union Miniere du Haut Katanga), for the sale of uranium ores and concentrates to said Agency shall continue in effect until their expiration as provided in these contracts.

2. The Government of Belgium will use its best endeavors to see that the Combined Development Agency will have a first option to purchase:

(a) 90 percent of the uranium and thorium ores and concentrates produced in Belgium and the Belgian Congo during calendar years 1956 and 1957.

(b) 75 percent of the uranium and thorium ores and concentrates produced in Belgium and the Belgian Congo during calendar years 1958, 1959, and 1960.

3. In addition to the percentage stated in the foregoing schedule with respect to any calendar year, this option shall also extend to such additional quantities of uranium ores and concentrates to provide for the production of the materials sold to Belgium by the Commission in accordance with paragraphs A and B of this Article during any such year. The formulae for the purpose of making computations required to give effect to this provision are:

(a) 102 kilograms of contained elemental uranium in the form of ore or ore concentrates will provide for 100 kilograms of elemental uranium of natural isotopic composition in the form of purified metal or compounds.

(b) The preparation of uranium enriched in U–235 content will be assumed to be accomplished by the isotopic separation of uranium of natural isotopic composition into enriched material having the required U–235 content and depleted material having a U–235 content of 0.4 percent.

4. If the Belgian Government does not require for its own use all or part of the uranium and thorium ores produced in Belgium and the Belgian Congo during the foregoing period and which are not covered by the options in subparagraphs E 2 and E 3, it will consult with the Commission concerning the sale of such uranium and thorium ores to the Combined Development Agency.

5. Belgium will in due course evaluate its requirements of uranium and thorium ores and concentrates for the period of this Agreement remaining after calendar year 1960, and the parties hereto will consult with each other for the purpose of establishing an agreed percentage of such materials which the Combined Development Agency shall have the first option to purchase.

6. It is agreed that the Government of Belgium shall be kept informed of the division, between the United States and the United Kingdom, of uranium and thorium ores and

concentrates sold to the Combined Development Agency in accordance with this Agreement. Belgium agrees that if so requested by the Commission and the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority, the options to the Combined Development Agency in subparagraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5 of this paragraph may be exercised as follows:

(a) Through a contract or contracts with either the Commission or the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority; or

(b) Through a contract or contracts with the Commission and a contract or contracts with the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority.

7. (a) If before the termination of this Agreement (1) the diminution of available ore supply results in a decline in the rate of production of uranium ores and concentrates in Belgium and the Belgium Congo by as much as 80 (eighty) percent of the rate of production in 1955 and (2) if the strategic stockpiles of special nuclear material in the United States and the United Kingdom have been demilitarized or if the civilian needs in the United States and the United Kingdom are covered without limitation by means of production and current imports of uranium ores and uranium concentrates, the Government of Belgium shall have the right to purchase from the Commission on such terms as are agreed a total quantity of material, in the form and manner described in (b) of this subparagraph, as is equivalent to the total quantity of uranium ores and concentrates sold under and during the period of this Agreement (1) to the Combined Development Agency, and acquired by the Commission, and (2) directly to the Commission if uranium ores and concentrates are sold to the Commission in accordance with paragraph 6 of this Article.

(b) (1) At the election of the Combined Development Agency or the Commission, whichever is appropriate, the material so sold to the Government of Belgium may be in the form of ores and concentrates or uranium of normal isotopic composition in the form of purified metals or compounds or any combination of these.

(2) In determining that quantity of one of these materials which is equivalent to a given quantity of another, the formulae in paragraph E 3 (a) shall be used.

(3) The material shall be delivered within 5 years after this provision comes into effect in accordance with an agreed schedule of deliveries.

F. As may be necessary and as mutually agreed in connection with the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article III, and under the limitations set forth therein, specific arrangements may be made from time to time between the Parties for lease, or sale and purchase, of quantities of materials, other than special nuclear materials, greater than those required for research, under such terms and conditions as may be mutually agreed, except as provided in Article VIII.

ARTICLE VIII—MATERIALS AND FACILITIES PRIMARILY OF MILITARY SIGNIFICANCE

It is agreed that the Commission will not transfer any materials under Article IV or Article VII F and will not transfer or permit the export of any materials or equipment and devices under Articles V and VI if such materials or equipment and devices are in the opinion of the Commission primarily of military significance.

ARTICLE IX—PATENTS

The United States shall have all rights, title, and interest within its jurisdiction as to any inventions or discoveries made by any person under the jurisdiction of the Belgian Government as a result of such person's access to Restricted Data communicated to Belgium under this Agreement, provided such invention or discovery is made during the period of this Agreement or within three years thereafter.

ARTICLE X—SECURITY

A. The criteria of security classification established by the Commission shall be applicable to all information and material, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this Agreement. The Commission will keep the Government of Belgium informed concerning these criteria and any modifications thereof, and the Parties will consult with each other from time to time concerning the practical application of these criteria.

B. It is agreed that all information and material, including equipment and devices, which warrant a classification in accordance with paragraph A of this Article shall be safeguarded in accordance with the security safeguards and standards prescribed by the security arrangements between the Government of the United States, represented by the Commission, and the Government of Belgium in effect on June 15, 1955.

C. It is agreed that the recipient Party of any material, including equipment and devices, and of any classified information under this Agreement shall not further disseminate such information or transfer such material, including equipment and devices, to any other country without the written consent of the originating country. It is further agreed that neither Party to this Agreement will transfer to any other country any equipment or device, the transfer of which would involve the disclosure of any classified information received from the other Party, without the written consent of such other Party.

ARTICLE XI—GUARANTIES PRESCRIBED BY THE UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

The Government of Belgium guarantees that:

A. The security safeguards and standards prescribed by the security arrangements between the Government of the United States, represented by the Commission, and the Government of Belgium in effect on June 15, 1955, will be maintained with respect to all classified information and materials, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this Agreement.

B. No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to Belgium by purchase or otherwise pursuant to this Agreement will be used for atomic weapons, or for research on or development of atomic weapons, or for any other military purpose.

C. No material, including equipment and devices, or any Restricted Data transferred to Belgium pursuant to this Agreement will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of Belgium except as the Commission may agree to such a transfer to another nation, and then only if the transfer of the material or Restricted Data is within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the United States and the other nation.

ARTICLE XII—DEFINITIONS

For purposes of this Agreement:

A. "Atomic weapon" means any device utilizing atomic energy, exclusive of the means for transporting or propelling the device (where such means is a separable and divisible part of the device), the principal purpose of which is for use as, or for development of, a weapon, a weapon prototype, or a weapon test device.

B. "Byproduct material" means any radioactive material (except special nuclear material) yielded in or made radioactive by exposure to the radiation incident to the process of producing or utilizing special nuclear material.

C. "Classified" means a security designation of "Confidential" or higher applied, under the laws and regulations of either the Government of Belgium or the Government of the United States, to any data, information, materials, services or any other matter, and includes "Restricted Data."

D. "Combined Development Agency" means the contracting Agency which acts on behalf of the United States and the United Kingdom with respect to the purchase of uranium and thorium ores and concentrates.

E. "Equipment and devices" and "equipment or device" means any instrument, apparatus, or facility and includes any facility, except an atomic weapon, capable of making use of or producing special nuclear material, and component parts thereof.

F. "Person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, group, government agency or government corporation but does not include the Parties to this Agreement.

G. "Reactor" means an apparatus, other than an atomic weapon, in which a self-supporting fission chain reaction is maintained by utilizing uranium, plutonium, or thorium, or any combination of uranium, plutonium, or thorium.

H. "Restricted Data" means all data concerning (1) design, manufacture, or utilization of atomic weapons; (2) the production of special nuclear material; or (3) the use of special nuclear material in the production of energy, but shall not include data declassified or removed from the category of Restricted Data by the appropriate authority.

I. "Special nuclear material" means (1) plutonium, uranium enriched in the isotope 233 or in the isotope 235, and any other material which the Government of Belgium or the Commission determines to be special nuclear material; or (2) any material artificially enriched by any of the foregoing.

ARTICLE XIII—EXISTING ARRANGEMENTS

This Agreement shall supersede all existing arrangements between the Parties concerning atomic energy matters (1) except insofar as these arrangements are reflected in commercial contracts, the continuation of which is provided for in Article VII E 1, (2) except any contracts between the Commission and the Government of Belgium which by their terms provides otherwise, and (3) except any arrangements with regional defense organizations of which the Government of Belgium is a member.

In witness whereof, the parties hereto have caused this Agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at Washington in duplicate this 15th day of June 1955, in the English and French languages, but in any case in which divergence between the two versions results in different interpretations the English version shall be given preference.

For the Government of the United States of America:

ROBERT MURPHY.
LEWIS L. STRAUSS.

For the Government of Belgium:

SILVERCRUYS.

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the attached "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of Belgium and the Government of the United States of America," and authorize its execution by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

There exists a special relationship between the Government of Belgium and the Government of the United States in the field of atomic energy, and beginning with discussions initiated in 1940 the two Governments have closely cooperated with each other in this field. Under an arrangement made in 1944, the Belgian Government agreed with the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom that all uranium ores

wherever located should be subject to effective control for the protection of civilization, and the Government of Belgium undertook to insure the effective control of such ores located in all territories subject to its authority. The Belgian Government also agreed that all uranium ores in the Belgian Congo, including ore from the rich Shinkolobwe Mine, should be made available to the United States and the United Kingdom through commercial contracts, and that it would use its best endeavors to supply such quantities of uranium ores as might be required by the Government of the United States and the United Kingdom. The Governments of the United States and of the United Kingdom, on their part, agreed that the Belgian Government should participate on equitable terms in the utilization of these ores as a source of energy for commercial power at such time as the two Governments should decide to employ the ores for this purpose.

Since the 1944 arrangement, the Government of Belgium, through commercial contracts, has made available to the United States and to the United Kingdom a vitally important quantity of uranium produced in the Belgian Congo. This has constituted a unique contribution to the defense of the Western World and to our strength as a nation dedicated to the preservation of peace and freedom.

In addition to being the principal foreign supplier of uranium, Belgium's interest in atomic energy is also evident in its strong scientific and technical community. This interest led in 1950 to the appointment of an atomic energy commissioner to coordinate the country's atomic energy programs, and current plans call for work in both the research and power fields. The United States now has the opportunity to assist Belgium in these programs and thus materially express our gratitude for the great contribution the Belgians have made to our common defense and security.

The proposed agreement calls for an exchange of classified and unclassified information relating to the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy, and particularly the development of atomic power, including general information in the overall progress and economics of power reactor programs and technological information required for the construction of specific reactors for the Belgian program in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, and Ruanda-Urundi, and other specified reactor information. The agreement also provides for an exchange of research materials not available commercially and for the transfer of equipment and devices. However, the parties will not exchange Restricted Data under the agreement relating to design or fabrication of atomic weapons or information which, in the opinion of the Commission, is primarily of military significance; and no Restricted Data concerning the production of special nuclear materials will be exchanged except that concerning the incidental production of special nuclear materials in a power reactor. Further, the Commission will not transfer any materials or equipment and devices which, in the opinion of the Commission, are primarily of military significance.

It is provided in the proposed agreement that the Commission will sell to the Government of Belgium such quantities of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 as Belgium may require during the period of this agreement for use in research and power reactors located in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, and Ruanda-Urundi, subject to any limitations in connection with quantities of such material available for such distribution by the Commission during any year, and subject to the further limitation that the quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 of weapon quality in the possession of Belgium by reason of transfer under the agreement shall not, in the opinion of the Commission, be of military significance. Enriched uranium to be sold under the agreement will be limited to uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235. The Government of Belgium, on its part, will give to the Commission an option to purchase any special nuclear materials produced in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, or Ruanda-Urundi from materials purchased from the Commission and which are in excess of Belgium's need in its program for the peacetime uses of atomic energy. The agreement also provides for the continuance of existing commercial contracts relating to the sale of uranium ores and concentrates; and the Government of Belgium undertakes to use its best endeavors to see that the Combined Development Agency (a contracting agency which acts on behalf of the United States and the United Kingdom with respect to the purchase of uranium and thorium ores and concentrates) will have a first option to purchase 90 percent of the uranium and thorium and concentrates produced in Belgium and the Belgian Congo during calendar years 1956 and 1957, and 75 percent of such ores and concentrates produced during the calendar years 1958, 1959, and 1960. Belgium also agrees to evaluate its requirements of uranium and thorium ore concentrates for the period of the agreement remaining after calendar year 1960 and to consult with the United States for the purpose of establishing an agreed percentage of materials which thereafter the Combined Development Agency shall have the first option to purchase. Equitable consideration has led to incorporating in the agreement a formula whereby the Government of Belgium may repurchase material in the event the diminution of available ore supply results in a decline in the rate of production of uranium ores and concentrates in Belgium and the Belgian Congo by as much as 80 percent of the rate of production in 1955 and if the strategic stockpiles of special nuclear material in the United States and the United Kingdom have been demilitarized.

The proposed agreement is in keeping with the previous undertaking of the United States that the Belgian Government should participate on equitable terms in the utilization of uranium ores as a source of energy for commercial power when the decision was made to employ the ores for this purpose. It represents, in the opinion of the Commission, an important step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Belgium, in accordance with the policy which you have established concerning such development in the free nations of the world. The consideration and benefit which will flow to the United States is very real, and the proposed agreement will further solidify the friendship we now enjoy with Belgium. Its performance will materially assist in assuring the continuance of peace and freedom in our countries and throughout the Western World.

Respectfully,

L. L. STRAUSS,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 15, 1955.

The Honorable L. L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of June 15, 1955, the Atomic Energy Commission recommended that I approve a proposed agreement for cooperation concerning the civil uses of atomic energy between the Government of Belgium and the Government of the United States of America.

The Commission's letter of recommendation refers to the special relationship between Belgium and the United States in the atomic-energy field and to the arrangements which have been in effect since 1944 with respect to uranium ores from the Belgian Congo. The Commission's letter also states that the important quantity of uranium made available by the Government of Belgium has constituted a unique contribution to the defense of the free world and to our strength as a nation dedicated to the preservation of peace and freedom.

I am in complete accord with the Commission's view concerning the importance of the Belgian contribution, and take this opportunity to ask that you personally convey the gratitude of our people to the appropriate representatives of the Belgian Government.

I have examined the agreement recommended. It calls for an exchange of classified and unclassified information relating to the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy and particularly to the development of atomic power, for the exchange of research materials not available commercially, and for the transfer of equipment and devices. It is provided, however, that the parties to the agreement will not exchange restricted data relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons or information which, in the opinion of the Commission, is primarily of military significance. Further, no restricted data concerning the production of special nuclear material will be exchanged, except that concerning the incidental production of such material in a power reactor; nor will the Commission transfer any materials or equipment or devices which, in the opinion of the Commission, are primarily of military significance.

It is also provided in the recommended agreement that the Commission will sell special nuclear material to the Government of Belgium in such quantities as may be required during the term of the agreement for use in research and power reactors located in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, and Ruanda-Urundi, subject to any limitations in connection with quantities of such material available for distribution during any year and the further limitation that the quantity of material of weapons quality in possession of Belgium by reason of transfer under the agreement shall not be of military significance.

The benefits which the United States will receive in the performance of the proposed agreement are substantial. Belgium, on its part, will give the Commission an option to purchase special nuclear materials produced in Belgian reactors from materials purchased from the Commission which are in excess of Belgium's need in its program for the peacetime uses of atomic energy. The agreement also provides for the continuance of commercial contracts relating to the sale of uranium ores and concentrates, and Belgium undertakes to use its best endeavors to see that the Combined Development Agency will have a first option on a large percentage of ores and concentrates produced through calendar year 1960.

In addition to the benefits which the United States will receive, the proposed agreement responds to a previous undertaking by the United States that the Belgian Government should participate on equitable terms in the utilization of uranium ores as a source of energy for commercial power.

Accordingly, pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby—

(1) Approve the within proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of Belgium concerning the civil uses of atomic energy;

(2) Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States; and

(3) Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of

the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT EISENHOWER.

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1955.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123 (c) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 there is submitted with this letter:

(1) A proposed agreement for cooperation with the Government of Belgium;

(2) A letter dated June 15, 1955, from the Commission to the President recommending his approval of the proposed agreement;

(3) A letter dated June 15, 1955, from the President to the Commission approving the proposed agreement, authorizing its execution, and containing his determination that the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

This proposed agreement for cooperation calls for the exchange of classified and unclassified information and material, including restricted data, and is more extensive in scope than the unclassified research agreements which previously have been submitted to this session of the Congress.

The arrangement contained in the proposed agreement results from the special relationship which exists between Belgium and the United States in the atomic energy field.

Sincerely yours,

L. L. STRAUSS,
Chairman.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND FOR COOPERATION REGARDING ATOMIC INFORMATION FOR MUTUAL DEFENSE PURPOSES

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,

Recognizing that their mutual security and defense requires that they be prepared to meet the contingencies of atomic warfare,

Recognizing that their common interests will be advanced by the exchange of information pertinent thereto,

Believing that the exchange of such information can be undertaken without threat to the security of either country, and

Taking into consideration the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954, which was prepared with these purposes in mind,

Agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

1. While the United States and the United Kingdom are participating in international arrangements for their mutual defense and security and making substantial and material contribution thereto, each Government will from time to time make available to the other Government atomic information which the Government making such information available deems necessary to:

(a) the development of defense plans;

(b) the training of personnel in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons; and

(c) the evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons.

2. Atomic information which is transferred by either Government pursuant to this Agreement shall be used by the other Government exclusively for the preparation and implementation of defense plans in the mutual interests of the two countries.

ARTICLE II

1. All transfers of atomic information to the United Kingdom by the United States pursuant to this Agreement will be made in compliance with the provisions of the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and any subsequent applicable United States legislation. All transfers of atomic information to the United States by the United Kingdom pursuant to this Agreement will be made in compliance with the United Kingdom Official Secrets Acts, 1911–1939, and the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

2. Under this Agreement there will be no transfers by the United States or the United Kingdom of atomic weapons or special nuclear material, as these terms are defined in Section 11 d. and Section 11 t. of the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

ARTICLE III

1. Atomic information made available pursuant to this Agreement shall be accorded full security protection under applicable security arrangements between the United States and the United Kingdom and applicable national legislation and regulations of the two countries. In no case shall either Government maintain security standards for safeguarding atomic information made available pursuant to this Agreement lower than those set forth in the applicable security arrangements in effect on the date this Agreement comes into force.

2. Atomic information which is exchanged pursuant to this Agreement will be made available through channels existing or hereafter agreed for the exchange of classified defense information between the two Governments.

3. Atomic information received pursuant to this Agreement shall not be transferred by the recipient Government to any unauthorized person or, except as provided in Article V of this Agreement, beyond the jurisdiction of that Government. Each Government may stipulate the degree to which any of the categories of information made available to the other Government pursuant to this Agreement may be disseminated, may specify the categories of persons who may have access to such information, and may impose such other restrictions on the dissemination of such information as it deems necessary.

ARTICLE IV

As used in this Agreement, "atomic information" means:

(a) so far as concerns the information provided by the United States, Restricted Data, as defined in Section 11 r. of the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954, which is permitted to be communicated pursuant to the provisions of Section 144 b. of that Act, and information relating primarily to the military utilization of atomic weapons which has been removed from the Restricted Data category in accordance with the provisions of Section 142 d. of the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954;

(b) so far as concerns the information provided by the United Kingdom, information exchanged under this Agreement which is either classified atomic energy information or other United Kingdom defense information which it is decided to transfer to the United States in pursuance of Article I of this Agreement.

ARTICLE V

Nothing herein shall be interpreted or operate as a bar or restriction to consultation and cooperation by the United States or the United Kingdom with other nations or regional organizations in any fields of defense. Neither Government, however, shall communicate atomic information made available by the other Government pursuant to this Agreement to any nation or regional organization unless the same information has been made available to that nation or regional organization by the other Government in accordance with its own legislative requirements and except to the extent that such communication is expressly authorized by such other Government.

ARTICLE VI

This Agreement shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall receive from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such an Agreement, and shall remain in effect until terminated by mutual agreement of both Governments.

Done at Washington this Fifteenth day of June 1955 in two original texts.

For the United States of America:

C. BURKE ELBRICK.

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

R. H. SCOTT.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, June 14, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Section 144 b. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 empowers you to authorize the Department of Defense, with the assistance of the Atomic Energy Commission, to cooperate with another nation or regional defense organization to which the United States is a party and to communicate to that nation or organization such atomic information as is necessary to the development of defense plans, the training of personnel in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons, and the evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons. This cooperation and communication, however, may be undertaken only in accordance with the limitations imposed by the Act and under an agreement entered into pursuant to Section 123 thereof.

The first of these agreements was with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It was approved by you on April 13, 1955, and has been before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for the required thirty-day period. With the cooperation of the Department of State, a separate agreement has now been negotiated with the United Kingdom and recommended for signature. This proposed agreement is submitted herewith for your approval.

It is the view of this Department that this agreement is entirely in accord with the provision of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. I am convinced that it will fully serve the best interests of the United States by making possible a further significant extension of the close cooperation in the field of mutual defense which has characterized our relationships with the United Kingdom for so many years. I, therefore, strongly recommend that you approve this proposed agreement as required by section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act and transmit the agreement to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, together with your determinations and authorizations as to execution.

With great respect, I am,

Faithfully yours,

C. E. WILSON.

JUNE 15, 1955.

The Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, I hereby submit to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy a proposed agreement between the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom for cooperation regarding communication of atomic information for mutual-defense purposes under section 144 (b) of the act.

Under the terms of the proposed agreement, the United States may exchange with the United Kingdom, so long as the United Kingdom pursuant to an international arrangement continues to make substantial and material contributions to the mutual-defense effort, atomic information which the United States considers necessary to—

(1) the development of defense plans;

(2) the training of personnel in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons; and

(3) the evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons.

The United Kingdom will make atomic information available to the United States on the same basis.

Atomic information made available pursuant to the proposed agreement will not be transferred to unauthorized persons, or beyond the jurisdiction of the recipient government except where that information is to be communicated to another nation or regional organization which has already been given the same information under an agreement similar to this and then only to the extent such transfer is specifically authorized by the originating government.

Transfers of atomic information by the United States under the proposed agreement will be made only in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and such information will be safeguarded by the stringent security arrangements in effect between the United States and the United Kingdom when this agreement comes into force.

The agreement will remain in effect until terminated by agreement between the two Governments, but the actual exchange of atomic information is entirely discretionary.

The Department of Defense has strongly recommended approval of this agreement. It is my firm conviction that through the cooperative measures foreseen in this agreement we will have aided materially not only in strengthening our own defenses but also those of our British ally and will thereby contribute greatly to the mutual-defense efforts which are of such vital importance to the maintenance of our common freedom.

Accordingly, I hereby determine that the performance of this proposed agreement will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security, and approve this agreement. In addition, I hereby authorize, subject to the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the Secretary of State to execute the proposed agreement and the Department of Defense, with the assistance of the Atomic Energy Commission, to cooperate with the United Kingdom and to communicate restricted data to the United Kingdom under the agreement.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA FOR COOPERATION REGARDING ATOMIC INFORMATION FOR MUTUAL DEFENSE PURPOSES

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada,

Recognizing that their mutual security and defense requires that they be prepared to meet the contingencies of atomic warfare,

Recognizing that their common interests will be advanced by the exchange of information pertinent thereto,

Believing that the exchange of such information can be undertaken without threat to the security of either country, and

Taking into consideration the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and the Canadian Atomic Energy Control Act and Atomic Energy Regulations, which were prepared with these purposes in mind,

Agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

1. While the United States and Canada are participating in international arrangements for their mutual defense and security and making substantial and material contribution thereto, each Government will from time to time make available to the other Government atomic information which the Government making such information available deems necessary to:

(a) the development of defense plans;

(b) the training of personnel in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons; and

(c) the evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons.

2. Atomic information which is transferred by either Government pursuant to this Agreement shall be used by the other Government exclusively for the preparation and implementation of defense plans in the mutual interests of the two countries.

ARTICLE II

1. All transfers of atomic information to Canada by the United States pursuant to this Agreement will be made in compliance with the provisions of the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and any subsequent applicable United States legislation. All transfers of atomic information to the United States by Canada pursuant to this Agreement will be made in compliance with the Atomic Energy Control Act and the Atomic Energy Regulations of Canada or subsequent applicable Canadian legislation and regulations.

2. Under this Agreement there will be no transfers by the United States or Canada of atomic weapons or special nuclear material, as these terms are defined in Section 11 d. and Section 11 t. of the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

ARTICLE III

1. Atomic information made available pursuant to this Agreement shall be accorded full security protection under applicable security arrangements between the United States and Canada and applicable national legislation and regulations of the two countries. In no case shall either Government maintain security standards for safeguarding atomic information made available pursuant to this Agreement lower than those set forth in the applicable security arrangements in effect on the date this Agreement comes into force.

2. Atomic information which is exchanged pursuant to this Agreement will be made available through channels existing or hereafter agreed for the exchange of classified defense information between the two Governments.

3. Atomic information received pursuant to this Agreement shall not be transferred by the recipient Government to any unauthorized person or, except as provided in Article V of this Agreement, beyond the jurisdiction of that Government. Each Government may stipulate the degree to which any of the categories of information made available to the other Government pursuant to this Agreement may be disseminated, may specify the categories of persons who may have access to such information, and may impose such other restrictions on the dissemination of such information as it deems necessary.

ARTICLE IV

As used in this Agreement, "atomic information" means:

(a) so far as concerns the information provided by the United States, Restricted Data, as defined in Section 11 r. of the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954, which is permitted to be communicated pursuant to the provisions of Section 144 b. of that Act and information relating primarily to the military utilization of atomic weapons which has been removed from the Restricted Data category in accordance with the provisions of Section 142 d. of the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954;

(b) so far as concerns the information provided by Canada, classified information relating to the military application of atomic energy.

ARTICLE V

Nothing herein shall be interpreted or operate as a bar or restriction to consultation and cooperation by the United States or Canada with other nations or regional organizations in any field of defense. Neither Government, however, shall communicate atomic information made available by the other Government pursuant to this Agreement to any nation or regional organization unless the same information has been made available to that nation or regional organization by the other Government in accordance with its own legislative requirements and except to the extent that such communication is expressly authorized by such other Government.

ARTICLE VI

This Agreement shall enter into force on the date of receipt by the Government of Canada of a notification from the Government of the United States of America that the period of thirty days required by Section 123 c. of the U. S. Atomic Energy Act of 1954 has elapsed, and shall remain in effect until terminated by mutual agreement of both Governments.

Done at Washington this fifteenth day of June 1955 in two original texts.

For the United States of America:

C. BURKE ELBRICK.

For Canada:

A. D. P. HEENEY.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, June 10, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

Dear Mr. President: Section 144 b. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 empowers you to authorize the Department of Defense, with the assistance of the Atomic Energy Commission, to cooperate with another nation or regional defense organization to which the United States is a party and to communicate to that nation or organization such atomic information as is necessary to the development of defense plans, the training of personnel in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons, and the evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons. This cooperation and communication, however, may be undertaken only in accordance with the limitations imposed by the act and under an agreement entered into pursuant to Section 123 thereof.

The first of these agreements was with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It was approved by you on April 13, 1955, and has been before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for the required thirty-day period. With the cooperation of the Department of State, a separate agreement has now been negotiated with Canada and recommended for signature. This proposed agreement is submitted herewith for your approval.

It is the view of this Department that this agreement is entirely in accord with the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The execution of this agreement should do much to advance our mutual defense interests, especially the vital cause of North American defense in which we have long been working closely with our Canadian neighbors, and will thereby aid materially in the defense of the United States. I therefore strongly recommend that you approve this proposed agreement as required by Section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act and transmit the agreement to the Joint Committee on

Atomic Energy together with your determinations and authorizations as to execution.

With great respect, I am,

Faithfully yours,

C. E. WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 15, 1955.

The Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursant to section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, I hereby submit to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy a proposed agreement between the Governments of the United States and Canada for cooperation regarding communication of atomic information for mutual defense purposes under section 144 b. of the act.

Under the terms of the proposed agreement, the United States may exchange with Canada, so long as Canada pursuant to an international arrangement continues to make substantial and material contributions to the mutual defense effort, atomic information which the United States considers necessary to

(1) the development of defense plans;

(2) the training of personnel in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons; and

(3) the evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons.

Canada will make atomic information available to the United States on the same basis.

Atomic information made available pursuant to the proposed agreement will not be transferred to unauthorized persons, or beyond the jurisdiction of the recipient government except where that information is to be communicated to another nation or regional organization which has already been given the same information under an agreement similar to this and then only to the extent such transfer is specifically authorized by the originating government.

Transfers of atomic information by the United States under the proposed agreement will be made only in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and such information will be safeguarded by the stringent security arrangements in effect between the United States and Canada when this agreement comes into force.

The agreement will remain in effect until terminated by agreement between the two governments, but the actual exchange of atomic information is entirely discretionary.

The Department of Defense has strongly recommended approval of this agreement. It is my firm conviction that through the cooperative measures foreseen in this agreement we will have aided materially not only in strengthening our own defenses but also those of our Canadian ally and will thereby contribute greatly to the mutual defense efforts which are of such vital importance to the maintenance of our common freedom.

Accordingly, I hereby determine that the performance of this proposed agreement will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security, and approve this agreement. In addition, I hereby authorize, subject to the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the Secretary of State to execute the proposed agreement and the Department of Defense, with the assistance of the Atomic Energy Commission, to cooperate with Canada and to communicate restricted data to Canada under the agreement.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement, following the morning hour we are to commence the call of the calendar, beginning with order No. 523.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the clerk will proceed to state the bills and other measures on the calendar, beginning with order No. 523.

NICHOLAS NEAPOLITAKIS

The bill (S. 80) for the relief of Nicholas Neapolitakis was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nicholas Neapolitakis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

GERDA IRMGARD KURELLA

The bill (S. 176) for the relief of Gerda Irmgard Kurella was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gerda Irmgard Kurella, the fiance of Sergeant James D. Ritz, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Gerda Irmgard Kurella is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Sgt. James D. Ritz and that she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act other than the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of that act: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Gerda Irmgard Kurella, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Gerda Irmgard Kurella, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Gerda Irmgard Kurella as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

SPIRODON KAROUSATOS

The bill (S. 186) for the relief of Spirodon Karousatos was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act Spirodon Karousatos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

FELICIANO C. MENDOZA

The bill (S. 561) for the relief of Feliciano C. Mendoza was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Feliciano C. Mendoza shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

CHARLES F. GARRIZ

The bill (S. 562) for the relief of Charles F. Garriz was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Charles F. Garriz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

GERTRAUT HILDEGARDE MARIE HUBINGER AND FRANZ HUBINGER

The bill (S. 1884) for the relief of Gertraut Hildegarde Marie Hubinger and Franz Hubinger was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gertraut Hildegarde Marie Hubinger and Franz Hubinger shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

LUIGI CIANCI

The bill (H. R. 1062) for the relief of Luigi Cianci was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNA TOKATLIAN GULEZIAN

The bill (H. R. 1081) for the relief of Anna Tokatlian Gulezian was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAYER ROTHBAUM

The bill (H. R. 1086) for the relief of Mayer Rothbaum was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROSE MAZUR

The bill (H. R. 1108) for the relief of Rose Mazur was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARIA THERESIA REINHARDT AND HER CHILD, MARIA ANASTASIA REINHARDT

The bill (H. R. 1165) for the relief of Maria Theresia Reinhardt and her child, Maria Anastasia Reinhardt, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES CHAN

The bill (H. R. 1664) for the relief of Charles Chan was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MECYS JAUNISKIS

The bill (S. 664) for the relief of Mecys Jauniskis was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to address a specific inquiry to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. This bill provides for a waiver of the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which excludes persons afflicted with tuberculosis. On the previous call of the calendar, a similar bill, Calendar No. 452, Senate bill 235, was objected to by the minority calendar committee. I should like to inquire if there is any basis upon which the senior Senator from Minnesota believes this particular bill can be distinguished from the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the main objection was based upon signs of a tubercular condition which had prevailed at one time in this particular individual. The man's wife is a medical doctor in her own right. Dr. Ruta Jauniskis is employed by the Mounds Park Midway Hospital, St. Paul, which is a tubercular hospital. She not only has a cash reserve of her own, but she has an income of $400 a month in the Mounds Park Midway Tubercular Hospital. I am familiar with it. I have several times visited that hospital in years past. Therefore, there can be no question as to Federal responsibility, and no question of this individual becoming a charge or a financial burden on the Government.

In the first place, the wife is a medical doctor in her own right. She has finances of her own. She has an excellent income, and I think the most humane thing we could do would be to permit this man to enter the United States.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator for his explanation. I make no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Minnesota is satisfied—I am sure he is—that the beneficiary would receive proper medical attention?

Mr. THYE. Without question, or I would never have introduced a private relief bill in his behalf. There can be no question about the case. His wife is a doctor. She is employed in one of the well-known tubercular hospitals in Minnesota, and there can be no question involved.

Mr. PURTELL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 10, after the word "act", to insert a colon and *"Provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mecys Jauniskis may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act: *Provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IVA DRUZIANICH (IVA DRUZIANIC)

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1155) for the relief of Iva Druzianich (Iva Druzianic), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Iva Druzianich (Iva Druzianic) shall be deemed to be the natural-born minor alien child of John Druzianich, a citizen of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNA MARIE HITZELBERGER SCHEIDT, AND HER MINOR CHILD ROSANNE HITZELBERGER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1730) for the relief of Anna Marie Hitzelberger Scheidt, and her minor child Rosanne Hitzelberger, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the word "Act", to strike out the period and "The provisions of this section shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraphs known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act", and in lieu thereof to insert a colon and *"Provided,* That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (9) and (12) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anna Marie Hitzelberger Scheidt may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided,* That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Rosanne Hitzelberger, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Peter J. Scheidt, a citizen of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CARL E. EDWARDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 947) for the relief of Carl E. Edwards, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, line 5, after the word *"Provided"*, to strike out "That no benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment" and insert "That no benefits other than hospital and medical expense actually incurred shall accrue prior to the date of enactment of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

MOSES AARON BUTTERMAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1085) for the relief of Moses Aaron Butterman, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 10, after the word "act", to insert a colon and *"And provided further,* That the exemption granted herein shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

GISELA HOFMEIER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 606) for the relief of Gisela Hofmeier, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to strike out "for the purposes" and insert "in the administration"; in line 11, after the word "the", to strike out "immigration laws" and insert "provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act other than the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of that act: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act"; on page 2, line 10, after the word "sections", to strike out "241 and 242" and insert "242 and 243"; and in line 17, after the word "visa", to strike out "fee: *Provided*, That the exemption granted herein shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act" and insert "fee", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gisela Hofmeier, the financée of Robert E. Leonard, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Gisela Hofmeier is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Sgt. Robert E. Leonard and that she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act other than the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of that act: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Gisela Hofmeier she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Gisela Hofmeier the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Gisela Hofmeier as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALE OF CERTAIN LAND IN ALASKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4853) to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Pacific Northern Timber Co., which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 2, after line 22, to strike out:

The conveyance shall be made upon the payment by the said Pacific Northern Timber Co. for the land at a price to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior through appraisal, plus the cost of survey and preparation of a plat of survey, after taking into consideration the purpose for which the land is to be used. Conveyance shall be made only if the said Pacific Northern Timber Co. makes the total payment within 1 year after notification by the Secretary of the Interior of the amount due: *Provided*, That the conveyance hereby authorized shall not include any land covered by a valid existing right initiated under the public land laws: *Provided further*, That the coal and other mineral deposits in the land shall be reserved to the United States, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under applicable laws and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior: *And provided further*, That any such patent shall be revoked and shall be of no further effect in the event the Pacific Northern Timber Co. fails to construct the sawmill facilities on or adjacent to this site required by its contract A10fs 1283 with the United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service.

And on page 3, after line 18, to insert:

SEC. 2. That the land shall be sold to the said Pacific Northern Timber Co. at a reasonable appraised price to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, plus the cost of survey and preparation of a plat of survey. Conveyance shall be made only if the said Pacific Northern Timber Co. makes the total payment due within 1 year after notification by the Secretary of the Interior of the amount due: *Provided*, That the coal, oil, and other mineral deposits in the land shall be reserved to the United States, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under applicable laws and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2220) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for the construction of plants and facilities, including acquisition or condemnation of real property or facilities, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 6042) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This bill is the unfinished business. Without objection, it will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1713) to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681) and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, this bill is not one which should be considered on the call of the calendar, in my judgment. Furthermore, request has been made that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2973) to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract of land in Macon County, Ga., to the Georgia State Board of Education, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

VOLUNTARY EXTENSIONS OF ENLISTMENTS IN THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

The bill (S. 1571) to authorize voluntary extensions of enlistments in the Army, Navy, and Air Force for periods of less than 1 year was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fifth paragraph under the heading "Pay, miscellaneous" of the act of August 22, 1912 (ch. 335, 37 Stat. 331), as amended, is amended by deleting the word "either" and substituting therefor the words "less than 1 year or for a period of."

SEC. 2. The term of enlistment of any enlisted man in the Army and the Air Force may, by his voluntary written agreement, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary concerned, be extended for a period of less than 1 year from the date of expiration of the then existing term of enlistment, and subsequent to said date such enlisted men as extend the term of enlistment as authorized in this section shall be entitled to and shall receive the same pay and allowances in all respects as though regularly discharged and reenlisted immediately upon expiration of their term of enlistment, and such extension shall not operate to deprive them upon discharge at the termination thereof of any right, privilege, or benefit to which they would be entitled at the expiration of the former term of enlistment.

MONTHLY PAYMENTS FOR CERTAIN MILITARY PERSONNEL

The bill (S. 1725) to repeal two provisions of law requiring that certain military personnel shall be paid monthly was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1268 of the Revised Statutes is repealed.

SEC. 2. The last proviso in subtitle "pay" of the act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 400), is repealed.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN BENEFITS OF MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The bill (S. 2135) to provide for the suspension of certain benefits in the case of members of the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps ordered to extended active duty in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 854), as amended, is further amended by deleting the final period, inserting a colon in lieu thereof, and adding the following new proviso: *"Provided further*, That in the case of any member of the Naval or Marine Corps Reserve receiving a pension, retainer pay, disability compensation, or retired pay from the Gov-

ernment of the United States by virtue of prior military service who is ordered to extended active duty in excess of 30 days in time of war or national emergency and is found physically qualified to perform active duty, entitlement to the pension, retainer pay, disability compensation, or retired pay shall be suspended for the period of the extended active duty unless that compensation is greater than the compensation specified in clause (1) of this section. During the period of such suspension the member shall receive compensation for such extended active duty as specified in clause (1) of this section. Upon termination of the period of extended active duty the pension, retainer pay, disability compensation, or retired pay of the member shall be resumed and paid as provided by law. The suspension herein provided shall not operate to affect any other rights or benefits to which the member or his dependents may be entitled under this or any other provision of law."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the act of September 27, 1950 (ch. 1053, 64 Stat. 1067), is amended by inserting before the final period a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That in the case of any such member receiving a pension, retirement pay, disability compensation, or retired pay from the Government of the United States by virtue of prior military service who is ordered to extended active duty for a period in excess of 30 days in time of war or national emergency and is found physically qualified to perform active duty, entitlement to the pension, retirement pay, disability compensation, or retired pay shall be suspended for the period of the extended active duty unless that compensation is greater than the compensation specified in clause (1) of this section. During the period of extended active duty the member shall receive the compensation for that duty specified in clause (1) of this section. Upon termination of the period of extended active duty the pension, retirement pay, disability compensation, or retired pay of the member shall be resumed and paid as provided by law. The suspension herein provided shall not operate to affect any other rights or benefits to which the member or his dependents may be entitled under this or any other provision of law."

SEC. 3. Section 3 of the act of September 27, 1950 (ch. 1053, 64 Stat. 1067), is hereby amended by changing the comma after "1947" to a period and striking out the words "and shall terminate 5 years after the date of approval of this act."

SEC. 4. The term "disability allowance" is deleted from section 10 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 854), as amended, and from section 2 of the act of September 27, 1950 (ch. 1053, 64 Stat. 1067).

EXTENSION OF MISSING PERSONS ACT

The bill (S. 2266) to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended, until July 1, 1956, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 15, Missing Persons Act (56 Stat. 147, 1093), as amended, is further amended by deleting "July 1, 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1956."

REGULATION OF THE SALE AND USE OF FIREWORKS IN THE CANAL ZONE

The bill (H. R. 4650) to amend the Canal Zone Code by the addition of provisions authorizing regulation of the sale and use of fireworks in the Canal Zone was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6499) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1582) to amend Public Law 727, 83d Congress, so as to extend the period for the making of emergency loans for agricultural purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 63) to provide for the appointment of the heads of regional and district offices of the Post Office Department by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1849) to provide for the grant of career conditional and career appointments in the competitive civil service to indefinite employees who previously qualified for competitive appointment was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 106) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 103) increasing the limit of expenditures by the Select Committee on Small Business was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

ADDITIONAL ELEVATORS IN SENATE WING OF THE CAPITOL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1993) authorizing the installation of additional elevators in the Senate wing of the Capitol, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 2, line 4, after the numeral "2", to strike out "There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this act" and insert "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $285,000 to carry out the provisions of this act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Architect of the Capitol is authorized and directed to prepare and submit to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate plans and specifications for the installation of two additional elevators in the Senate wing of the Capitol, to be located adjacent to and east of the existing elevators at the main east front entrance to the Senate wing. Upon approval of such plans and specifications by such committee, the Architect of the Capitol is authorized and directed to proceed with the procurement and installation of such elevators, including the making of such structural changes in the Capitol Building as may be necessary to provide for such installation.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $285,000 to carry out the provisions of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 232) authorizing the erection of a memorial gift from the Government of Venezuela was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4048) making recommendations to the States for the enactment of legislation to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE and Mr. PURTELL. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 21) to establish a Commission on Government Security was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

MILTON BEATTY AND OTHERS

The bill (S. 175) to provide for the relief of Milton Beatty and others by providing for determination and settlement of certain claims of former owners of lands and improvements purchased by the United States in connection with the Canyon Ferry Reservoir project, Montana, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk an original Senate resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 115), was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 175) entitled "A bill to provide for the relief of Milton Beatty and others by providing for determination and settlement of certain claims of former owners of lands and improvements purchased by the United States in connection with the Canyon Ferry Reservoir project, Montana," as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable

date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

Mr. PURTELL. This resolution, which has been prepared by the Legislative Counsel of the Senate at our request, is designed to refer the bill S. 175, Calendar No. 476, to the Court of Claims for a study by that court of the facts and circumstances which are the background of the claims for relief in that bill and for a report by the court to the Congress as to whether there is any entitlement to relief, legal or equitable, by the claimants, together with the recommendation of the court.

Mr. President, S. 175 would authorize the establishment of a 3-member Board of Appraisers, 1 to be an employee of the Interior Department and to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, 1 to be an employee of the Department of Agriculture and appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, and the third to be appointed from private life by the chief judge of the United States District Court for the District of Montana. The Board of Appraisers would appraise lands taken by the Federal Government from some 30 landowners, in the course of constructing Canyon Ferry Dam. The Board would determine whether or not these landowners received fair compensation and, if not, the amounts reasonably due them. The bill also makes provision directing the Secretary of the Treasury to make such payments as may be reasonably due.

It was the concern of the Republican Calendar Committee that the procedure contemplated in this bill would result in establishing a dangerous and possibly unfortunate precedent in the administration of claims involving the taking of land by the United States Government.

The procedure contemplated in the resolution which is now before the Senate would conform with past precedent and would give these claimants their day in court. It has the approval of the sponsor of the bill in the Senate, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the sponsor of a House companion bill, Representative METCALF.

I ask that the Senate agree to the resolution at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PURTELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as I understand, if the Senate adopts the resolution, the Court of Claims will be directed to utilize the services of an appraiser or appraisers, who will report his or their findings to the Court of Claims, which in turn will send to the Senate its report showing what damages, if any, are due.

Mr. PURTELL. The Court of Claims may designate a commissioner, who will submit his report to the court, which in turn will submit its report to the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then the Senate can take action on the basis of the report made to it by the Court of Claims. Is that correct?

Mr. PURTELL. After all interested parties are heard, the committee will get the report, and it, in turn, will submit its report to the Senate. The Senate can then determine what damages, if any, should be paid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 115) was considered and agreed to.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a memorandum on Senate bill 175.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM

Subject: S. 175, for the relief of Milton Beatty and others.

As reported from committee, this bill authorizes the establishment of a 3-member Board of Appraisers, 1 to be an employee of the Interior Department and to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, 1 to be an employee of the Department of Agriculture and appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, and the third to be appointed from private life by the chief judge of the United States District Court for the District of Montana. The Board of Appraisers would appraise lands taken by the Federal Government from some 30 landowners in the course of constructing Canyon Ferry Dam. The Board would determine whether or not these landowners received fair compensation, and if not, the amounts reasonably due them. The bill also makes provision directing the Secretary of the Treasury to make such payments as may be reasonably due.

The Republican Calendar Committee is mindful of the claims set out in the Judiciary Committee's report that when the Government's representatives advised of an intention to take the land it was stated that there would be a uniform land acquisition policy, and on that basis these claimants accepted the price that was offered, with very little negotiating, and that thereafter it was discovered that there was a considerable differentiation in price paid for different tracts. An example cited is of two adjoining parcels purchased within 10 days of each other, with similar improvements, fertility, and crop history, and which were sold in the one case at $158 per acre and the other at $300 per acre.

The Republican Calendar Committee is also mindful, however, of the adverse reports on this legislation by the Department of Justice and the Department of the Interior. Moreover, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts claims that the bill provides "for an unusual procedure for fixing the compensation of land purchased by the United States from the owners * * *."

The Justice Department states "to pay the beneficiaries of the bill additional sums would create a highly undesirable precedent." The Interior Department adds other cogent reasons for opposing this legislation, as follows:

"If these parties have, as we believe they do not have, a valid claim against the United States arising out of the land purchase contract, redress may be had in the courts of the United States under the Tucker Act, as amended and supplemented, without the special privilege which would be granted by the bill. We are unaware of any special circumstances or equitable considerations in their cases which entitle them to ask of the Congress a revaluation of their properties and a payment in excess of the amount for which they agreed to sell, and did sell, their properties. Not having availed themselves, as they could have if they were dissatisfied with the prices offered them, of the privilege of having a judicial determination made of the value of their properties at the time of the transaction, we can see no merit to their being given the consideration they now ask in another forum. Particularly is this so in a case like the present where changed conditions caused by the removal of improvements and the flooding of the land have made it impossible for anyone to make an estimate of fair market value of the land and improvements as of the date of payment by the United States of the agreed purchase price.

"Although what has already been said is enough, I believe, to indicate the lack of merit in S. 3154, I must also point out that its enactment would establish a precedent under which all the United States land purchase contracts could, at the behest of any vendor who later becomes dissatisfied with the bargain he made, be regarded as lacking that finality which is as important to the conduct of public business as it is normal to conventional business transactions."

The Republican Calendar Committee is impressed additionally by the statement quoted in the report of Congressman METCALF, who had held a hearing on a predecessor bill in 1953, that "there is not a charge of misrepresentation that will sustain a case in the Court of Claims."

In view of the foregoing, we are of the belief that enactment of this bill would set a most undesirable precedent. At the same time, however, we are of the belief that these claimants are entitled to a forum before which all of the parties can present the facts. For this reason we have prepared and submit for consideration by the Senate a resolution under which, pursuant to section 2509, title 28, United States Code, this bill, together with all pertinent papers and documents, shall be referred to the Court of Claims for report of its conclusions sufficient to inform Congress on the facts as to whether there is a legal or equitable claim and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States.

If the Senate should follow the course thus recommended and adopt the recommended resolution, the claimants in this case will not only be given a forum, but one which conforms with precedent and at the same time is entirely qualified by reason of its handling of a great body of cases involving land acquisition matters, pursuant to the jurisdiction conferred on the Court of Claims under the Tucker Act.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3005) to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VINSON, Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. ARENDS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 208. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas and Oklahoma to negotiate and enter into a

compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States;

H. R. 2984. An act authorizing E. B. Reyna, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Los Ebanos, Tex.;

H. R. 3878. An act to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended, pertaining to emergency flood-control work;

H. R. 4426. An act to amend section 7 of the act approved September 22, 1922, as amended;

H. R. 4573. An act authorizing Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 5188. An act to prohibit publication by the Government of the United States of any prediction with respect to apple prices;

H. R. 5841. An act to repeal the fee-stamp requirement in the Foreign Service and amend section 1728 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

H. R. 5842. An act to repeal a service charge of 10 cents per sheet of 100 words, for making out and authenticating copies of records in the Department of State;

H. R. 5860. An act to authorize certain officers and employees of the Department of State and the Foreign Service to carry firearms; and

H. R. 6410. An act to authorize the construction of a building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution, including the preparation of plans and specifications, and all other work incidental thereto.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The call of the calendar has been completed, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6042) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that under the unanimous-consent agreement there are 2 hours time on the bill to be equally divided and controlled by the majority and minority leaders. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes on the bill to the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc and that the bill as thus amended be considered as the original text for the purpose of further amendment, and that any point of order against the committee amendments be reserved.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, my understanding is that the bill would be treated as an original bill and, thereby, open to amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and the request is agreed to.

The committee amendments agreed to are as follows:

Under the heading "Title I—Office of the Secretary of Defense—Salaries and Expenses", on page 2, line 10, to strike out "$12,000,000" and insert "$12,250,000".

On page 2, line 11, after the word "Public", to strike out "Information" and insert "Affairs".

On page 2, line 13, after the word "Public", to strike out "Information, $400,000" and insert "Affairs, $420,000".

Under the heading "Title II—Interservice Activities—Emergency Fund", on page 4, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "$25,000,000," and insert "$35,000,000 and in addition not to exceed $200,000,000 to be used upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such funds can be wisely, profitably, and practically used in the interest of national defense and to be derived by transfer from such appropriations available to the Department of Defense for expenditure during the current fiscal year as the Secretary of Defense may designate."

Under the heading "Title III—Department of the Army—National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army", on page 11, line 17, after the word "Board", to strike out "$265,000" and insert "$500,000", and in line 20, after the word "amended", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year the Secretary of Defense shall, upon requisition of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, and without reimbursement, transfer from agencies of the Department of Defense to the Board ammunition costing not to exceed $1,200,000.

Under the subhead "Reduction in Appropriation—Army Stock Fund", on page 12, after line 18, to strike out:

No part of any appropriation in this act shall be used to pay rent on space to be used for recruiting purposes; and no part of any appropriation in this act may be used for pay and allowances of military personnel assigned to recruiting duty in excess of 50 percent of the amount expended for such purposes during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

Under the heading "Title IV—Department of the Navy—Marine Corps procurement," on page 15, line 11, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$286,500,000" and insert "$286,456,610."

Under the subhead "Shipbuilding and conversion," on page 17, line 20, after the word "critical" to insert "long lead time."

Under the subhead "Ships and facilities," on page 19, line 7, after the word "which", to strike out "$15,700,000" and insert "$16,240,000."

Under the subhead "Medical care," on page 21, line 16, after the word "salaries", to strike out "$62,500,000" and insert "$62,494,556."

Under the heading "Title V—Department of the Air Force—Aircraft and related procurement," on page 25, at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "$5,950,000,000" and insert "$6,306,000,000."

Under the subhead "Major procurement other than aircraft," on page 25, line 14, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$350,000,000" and insert "$349,862,600."

Under the subhead "Maintenance and operations," on page 27, line 21, after the word "Government", to strike out "$3,615,500,000" and insert "$3,597,496,570: *Provided*, That not to exceed $55,000,000 of the appropriation "Maintenance and operations, Air Force, 1953" shall remain available until expended solely for the liquidation of obligations heretofore incurred against such appropriation for assist takeoff units and armaments."

Under the subhead "Military personnel," on page 29, line 17, after the word "enlistment", to strike out "$3,670,000,000" and insert "$3,680,650,000."

Under the subhead "Air National Guard", on page 31, line 9, after the word "Defense", to strike out "$202,841,000" and insert "$192,191,000."

Under the subhead "Reductions in Appropriations—Air Force Stock Fund," on page 31, line 17, after the word "by", to strike out "$300,000,000" and insert "$75,000,000."

On page 31, after line 19, to strike out:

AIR FORCE INDUSTRIAL FUND

The amount available in the Air Force Industrial Fund is hereby reduced by $155 million, such sum to be covered into the Treasury immediately upon approval of this act.

Under the heading "Title VI—General Provisions," on page 40, line 12, after the word "than", to strike out "$40,000,000" and insert "$20,000,000."

On page 46, line 13, after the word "profession", to insert "in excess of three persons in each military department".

On page 46, line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$3,250,000" and insert "$3,270,000."

On page 49, line 2, after the word "cotton", to insert "spun silk yarn for cartridge cloth."

On page 50, line 2, after the word "the", to insert "Navy and"; in the same line, after the word "for", to strike out "two hundred and twenty-one" and insert "two hundred and fifty", and in line 3, after the word "for", to strike out "five hundred and three" and insert "seven hundred and fifty."

On page 51, after line 23, to strike out:

SEC. 638. No part of the funds appropriated in this act may be used for the disposal or transfer by contract or otherwise of work traditionally performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense unless it has

been justified before the appropriate committees of Congress that the disposal is economically sound and that the related services can be performed by a contractor without danger to national security.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 638. No part of the funds appropriated in this act may be used for the disposal or transfer by contract or otherwise of work that has been for a period of 25 years or more performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense unless certified by the Secretary of Defense and reported by him to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives at least 60 days in advance that the disposal is economically scund and that the related services can be performed by a contractor without danger to national security.

On page 52, after line 16, to insert:

SEC. 639. Effective April 15, 1955, and during the fiscal year 1956, under such regulations and in such localities as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, enlisted members granted permission to mess separately whose duties require them to purchase one or more meals from other than Government messes shall be entitled to not to exceed the pro rata allowance authorized for each such meal for enlisted members when rations in kind are not available.

On page 53, line 1, to change the section number from "639" to "640."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, last Friday night I gave the Senate a full presentation of what is contained in the Department of Defense appropriation bill. In that statement I discussed the strengths in men, ships, and airplanes contained in the bill. I discussed the amount of money the committee recommended for each of the three departments. I also discussed every change the committee has made in the bill as it came to the Senate from the House of Representatives.

I do not think it necessary at this time to repeat what I carefully explained then. It is available for all to read. But I shall mention a few highlights of the bill as it now comes to the Senate.

Bear in mind that the bill was reported by unanimous vote of the committee.

H. R. 6042 provides a total of $31,836,521,336 of new appropriations. I hope Senators will listen to the figures, because they are not small figures. This amount is approximately $348 million in excess of the amount provided by the House, but almost $400 million under the revised budget estimates.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should ask the Senator if the sum of $348 million was added before there was a budget request?

Mr. CHAVEZ. We had a budget request for a part of it, but for other parts of it we did not have budget figures. However, since that time the chairman of the subcommittee has received some correspondence from the Air Force indicating that the amount is not sufficiently large. Normally they do not take any action unless they have budgetary approval.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The bill as reported to the House contained a very large figure but it was approximately $390 million less than the budget estimates.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Major increases over the House amount are to be found in two areas. First, the committee restored $150 million for production of Air Force planes and added another $206 million for the same purpose. In other words, the committee restored $150 million which the House had eliminated, and added $206 million for the same purpose. This will speed up production of long-range jet aircraft and permit the replacement of B–36 bombers by newer types earlier than had previously been planned. The purpose is to use these funds in order to accelerate production now.

Second, the committee restored $10 million to the Research and Development Emergency Fund and also provided by transfer the availability of $200 million for the same purpose. That means that there is appropriated $10 additional new money and permission is granted to transfer from available funds $200 million more.

The committee was assured that these funds would be utilized only if the Secretary of Defense determined that they would be utilized "wisely, practically, and profitably" to exploit new research developments not at present crystallized, but which may be during the coming year.

As a great general of ours once stated about another defense appropriation act, this bill contains more funds than we would need if we knew we would never have to defend our country; it contains far short of the amount of money needed to fight a full-scale war. Some of us would have liked to have provided for somewhat higher Army and Marine Corps end strengths. But the committee voted to follow the recommendations of the Commander in Chief. However, notwithstanding that the committee took that action, I still insist that the Senate itself is supreme. If the Senate wishes to take some other action in connection with the matter it is the business of the Senate, and not that of the Executive.

As it is, this bill will provide funds to maintain and continue the development of the world's greatest Navy, the world's finest Air Force, and an Army, with its new weapons, which is increasing in firepower if not in numbers.

We have the know-how to build airplanes.

We have the know-how to build new weapons, and we have the manpower that will know what to do with those weapons.

I urge prompt enactment of this measure as a symbol of our determination to keep the free world strong.

I submit these round figures to the Senate:

The amount of the bill as passed by the House is $31,488,206,000.

The amount added by the Senate, net, is $348,315,336.

The total amount of the bill as reported to the Senate is $31,836,521,336.

I read from the report the amount of the 1956 budget estimates:

Original budget estimates, $31,405,000,000.

Revised budget estimates, $32,232,815,000.

The amount of the 1955 appropriations was $28,800,070,486.

The bill as reported to the Senate may be analyzed as follows:

It is over the original budget estimates, 1956, by $431,521,336.

It is under the revised budget estimates, 1956, by $396,293,664.

It is in excess of the appropriations for fiscal year 1955, by $3,036,450,850.

That is the statement so far as the money items are concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 6–15–55–A and ask that it be read. The amendment is sponsored by myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the junior Senator from North Dakota for himself and on behalf of other Senators will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 28, line 3, it is proposed to delete the period and insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall, during the fiscal year 1956, continue the maintenance, operation, and availability of the John Moses Veterans' Hospital at Minot, N. Dak., to meet requirements of the Veterans' Administration and the Department of the Air Force."

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes, which I think is all that will be necessary.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am very much in agreement with the amendment offered by the junior Senator from North Dakota and other Senators. I do not like to see the hospitals closed, so I will accept the amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. YOUNG. Thank you very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I thought it was necessary to yield back the unused time on the amendment before the amendment could be agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, was the unused time yielded back on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was automatically yielded back; actually, it was never allocated.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] to the fact that the bill is open to further amendment, in case he desires to call up his amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I desire to speak for a few minutes. Will the Senator from Texas yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was my privilege to listen to most of the testimony given on this bill, which provides for such a huge amount of appropriated funds to maintain our Armed Forces. It is my considered judgment that the Committee on Appropriations should have a little more assistance if we are to be able to grasp the circumstances surrounding these enormous appropriations.

As I pointed out before the committee, when the 1954 fiscal year ended last June 30, there was a total of $15,706,807,000 of unobligated funds in Department of Defense coffers. This huge amount was unobligated—not merely unexpended. I feel sure that when the representatives of our armed services came before the Senate Appropriations Committee to justify the appropriations for the 1954 fiscal year they must have made a good case for the entire amount they requested. Yet that fiscal year ended with more than $15 billion of unobligated funds in their accounts.

The fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, will find the military with unobligated funds aggregating $11.5 billion.

It strikes me, as I stated before the committee, that such huge unobligated balances lend themselves to our Armed Forces purchasing large amounts of materials of war which are not really needed. As I pointed out during the hearings, there is evidence in the record to show that the coming fiscal year—that is, fiscal 1956—will end with unobligated balances on hand totaling about $6,500,000,000.

It strikes me, Mr. President, that this is the wrong way to appropriate funds. The armed services have come before the committee and have asked for specific sums which they say will be needed during fiscal 1956. Yet they will end the year, according to their own testimony, with unobligated balances of approximately $6,492 million. It would appear to me that, somewhere along the line, there are items for which an excess of funds will be provided. Let me emphasize that no Member of this body wants the Armed Forces to be short any equipment they know they need. Yet it strikes me that in our study of these bills there is something wrong somewhere if our military leaders tell us that they will find themselves with more than $6 billion in unobligated—not only unspent but unobligated—funds in their coffers a year from now.

I made my presentation of this situation and my views thereon before the full committee; and, of course, I realize that the answers given by the armed services may have been somewhat plausible. They told us that they will need this sum, although they know they will not obligate it next year, so as to continue the availability of the funds into the following year—that is, fiscal 1957. Their position is that unless this huge amount is continued available to them, their program will be impeded—that they need the money to maintain an even and uninterrupted purchasing program.

The Department of Defense money bill will be on the President's desk, I believe, long before the end of fiscal 1955. Therefore, the necessity, as the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force put it, of having huge unobligated balances on hand in case of a lag in the appropriations bill lends itself, to my way of thinking, as I have said, to much overspending.

When I presented the matter to the full committee, when the bill was to be reported, the committee placed certain language in the report which, I believe, should help us deal with this problem. It is my hope that the armed services will take heed of it, and when they come before the committee next year will ask only for such funds as they intend to actually spend during the succeeding fiscal year. The language to which I refer appears at the top of page 3 of the report, and is as follows:

> The committee expresses strong disapproval of both carryovers and unobligated balances. While the matter of lead time and construction time is fully appreciated——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair regrets to announce that the time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I have 1 more minute?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I continue to read:

> nevertheless, it is felt that all items in the pipeline should have annual review by the committee. It is the expressed intention of the committee to work with the Departments of Defense and the Treasury to the end that unobligated balances be reduced to a minimum and a pay-as-you-go policy be established and carried out.
>
> By way of emphasis, it is the view of the committee that the practice of providing carryovers of unobligated balances from one fiscal year to another fiscal year be terminated without delay.

I express the hope that when the armed-services representatives appear before the committee next year they will not be in the position of telling us they need so many billion dollars, but that of that amount they expect to have a carryover of $6 billion—that such a tremendous amount of unobligated funds on hand is a necessity.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in connection with the statement I have just made, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, at this point a table showing the huge unobligated balances for the fiscal years 1954, 1955, and 1956.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY FUNCTIONS

Unobligated balances of general appropriations available for obligation in the subsequent year, fiscal years 1954, 1955, and 1956

[Thousands of dollars]

Department and appropriation (1)	Actual unobligated balance as of June 30, 1954 (2)	Estimated unobligated balance as of June 30, 1955 (3)	Estimated unobligated balance as of June 30, 1956 [1] (4)
Department of Defense, total	15,706,807	11,534,877	6,492,801
OSD and interservice activities:			
Construction of ships, MSTS	----------	2,800	----------
Reserve tools and facilities	100,000	----------	----------
Family housing	----------	25,000	----------
Total, OSD and interservice activities	100,000	27,800	----------
Department of the Army:			
Procurement and production	5,504,638	3,767,213	1,658,437
Military construction, Army	651,461	276,461	----------
Military construction, Army Reserve Forces	25,562	25,562	24,173
Research and development, Army	53,929	51,478	17,000
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Communication System	2,912	----------	----------
Construction, Alaska Communication System	1,249	1,276	----------
Total, Department of the Army	6,239,751	4,121,990	1,699,610
Department of the Navy:			
Marine Corps procurement	318,265	86,653	31,848
Aircraft and related procurement	1,103,299	1,001,887	516,764
Construction of ships	34,948	72,548	33,572
Shipbuilding and conversion	534,698	557,092	495,484
Navy military procurement	----------	----------	10,350
Ordnance for new construction	35,479	26,356	16,900
Public works	271,579	120,862	14,405
Military construction, Naval Reserve Forces	22,426	17,426	11,904
Construction, water supply facilities	1,716	1,616	----------
Research and development	[2] 926	5,000	5,000
Naval emergency fund	1,710	1,685	1,663
Total, Department of the Navy	2,325,046	2,491,125	1,137,889
Department of the Air Force:			
Aircraft and related procurement	4,658,142	3,325,000	3,350,000
Major procurement other than aircraft	1,052,853	830,000	250,000
Acquisition and construction of real property	1,207,492	647,492	----------
Research and development	123,523	91,469	55,302
Total, Department of the Air Force	7,042,010	4,893,961	3,655,302

[1] As shown in 1956 budget document.

[2] In addition, unobligated balances from other appropriations in amount of $7,777,000.

NOTE.—Amounts will not necessarily add to totals due to rounding.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Louisiana tell the Senate the figures for those particular fiscal years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana whatever time he may need. I do not wish to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement with regard to it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have already stated for the RECORD the huge unobligated balances. I have not gone into detail with regard to them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana such time as he may desire.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us take the Department of the Army. On June 30, 1954, the Department of the Army had an unobligated balance of $6,239,751,000. For the year ending June 30, 1955, the Department is going to have an unobligated balance of $4,121,990,000. With reference to the appropriation which the Department of the Army is now requesting, the one about which the Senator from New Mexico has spoken, the Department admits to us in advance it is not going to obligate all that money, but it will have an unobligated balance as of June 30, 1956, of $1,699,610,000.

Let us now turn to the Department of the Navy. On June 30, 1954, the Department of the Navy had an unobligated balance of $2,325,046,000. This year, as of June 30, 1955, the Navy will have an unobligated balance of $2,491,125,000. As of June 30, 1956, the Navy expects to have an unobligated balance of $1,137,889,000.

Referring now to the Department of the Air Force, the actual unobligated balance for the year ending June 30, 1954, was $7,042,010,000. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, which will be next week, the Department of the Air Force will have an unobligated balance of $4,893,961,000, or almost $5 billion.

When officials of the Department of the Air Force came before the committee to request appropriations last year, it was presumed the Department would spend or obligate the amount which they requested.

This year, of the amount of money which the Department requested for the next fiscal year, the officials tell us in advance they are going to end up, on June 30, 1956, with an unobligated balance of $3,655,302,000.

It strikes me we should be able to devise a plan whereby none of the departments in the Defense Establishment—the Navy, the Air Force, or the Army—will arrive at the end of the fiscal year with such huge unobligated balances. I repeat that such enormous balances lend themselves to large expenditures—to overexpenditure—and the buying of a great deal of material which is not needed. My hope is that in the future the departments will pattern their demands to accord with the amounts which they expect to actually obligate. It would appear to me, Mr. President, to be most imprudent for us to continue to appropriate these huge amounts when we are told in advance that the money will not all be spent. I realize full well that the majority of our armed services representatives are men of high honor and great competence, but I cannot rid myself of the thought that by continuing to make these huge amounts available, knowing in advance that they will not all be obligated, we are inviting overspending. We must have a thoroughly prepared military force, Mr. President, but this country cannot afford waste. It is my judgment that by cutting back on these huge amounts of funds for which no use has been devised by our military planners, we can do the taxpayers of this country and the military itself a great favor.

I thank the Senator from Texas for yielding me additional time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana has left the Chamber, but he has said substantially what I desired to say. One year ago the unobligated balances were more than $15 billion. At the end of this month there are scheduled to be more than $11 billion. At the end of the next fiscal year it is anticipated they will be in excess of $6 billion. That indicates a reduction in obligated balances of almost 50 percent in 2 years.

I agree absolutely with the Senator from Louisiana that unobligated balances should be brought as close to zero as possible. I know they can never be brought down to zero, but that is the goal to which the Senator from Louisiana referred, and he is right in expressing the hope that it may be attained. The present Secretary of Defense has reduced unobligated balances very substantially.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator may recall, I asked the Department of Defense to furnish us with such orders or rules as it may have promulgated with respect to the $11 billion it will carry over this year as an unobligated balance, but up to this very moment we have not heard from them. My guess is that the Department is not going to obligate the $11,534,877,000 which will be carried over.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think a great deal of it will not be obligated.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think most of it will not be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I have three amendments at the desk. I ask that they be stated, and considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc. The clerk will state the amendments.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, line 23, it is proposed to strike out "$616,438,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$650,244,000."

On page 15, lines 11 and 12, it is proposed to strike out "$286,456,610", and insert in lieu thereof "$290,190,000."

On page 16, line 3, it is proposed to strike out the "$172,750,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$181,605,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, under the unanimous-consent agreement 2 hours are allotted on each amendment, 1 hour to be controlled by the mover of the amendment and the other hour by the majority leader, unless he is agreeable to the amendment, in which event the hour is to be controlled by the minority leader. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I favor the amendments just submitted by the distinguished Senator from Missouri. Therefore, I assume that under the unanimous-consent agreement, the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], will control the time in opposition to the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct, according to the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without having the time required therefor charged to either side. These amendments are extremely important, and Senators should be on the floor to hear them discussed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I wish to say that I shall not object, but I desire to have the parliamentary situation clarified—let me say that I understand the Senator from Missouri is offering his amendments en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct; and, under the agreement, there will be 1 hour to each side on all 3 of the amendments, with 1 vote to be taken on all 3 of them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have no objection to the request that there be a quorum call at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, one of the amendments I have submitted to House bill 6042, the Defense Department Appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1956, offered for the purpose of preventing, if possible, a cut-back in the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps. The amendment provides for a fiscal year 1956 ending strength of 215,000 personnel. This, in effect, would continue throughout fiscal year 1956 the

end strength provided in the original 1955 appropriation act.

In this connection, it should be noted that these estimates must be approximate, in view of the fact that the strength of the Marine Corps is steadily dropping toward the revised goal of 205,000 on June 30, 1955. The actual cost would depend on the date when an authorized buildup to 215,000 was attained.

The effect of the amendment would be an increase in end strength of 22,000 men, over the administration's proposal of 193,000 men, with an increase in cost of $46,394,390. I repeat that for $46 million, which is scarcely 2 percent of our foreign-aid program cost, we can maintain 22,000 Regulars in the Marine Corps, at the same time that we are being forced to draft—to take from the farms and from the cities—men who have not volunteered, and who do no wish to be in the service.

Every man of these 22,000 is a volunteer; and this will make it possible for us to deal more fairly with the inductees and volunteers now in service.

Under the present law, a private or corporal or any other enlisted man who comes home from, let us say, 2 years of service in the Army, has an obligation of 6 years of Reserve membership, but he has no obligation for Reserve participation, such as weekly drills or summer training.

Under the House version of the bill, men now coming off active duty can be required, on an involuntary basis, to participate in either 48 weekly drills, with 2 weeks summer training, or 30-day summer training camps for each of 4 years. If the man fails to so participate, in effect he can be sent to jail.

A Marine volunteer has 3 years obligation and a 4-year Navy volunteer or Air Force volunteer has a 2-year obligation he did not know about when he enlisted for that term.

These men did not know that they would be given this additional training requirement when they entered active duty 2 years ago. We are, therefore, in effect, breaking faith with them by imposing this additional obligation upon them.

I believe that the adoption of this amendment will aid materially in the passage of the Reserve bill.

Before proceeding further this afternoon, I take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Armed Services Committee, for calling a hearing which resulted in an announced heavy step-up in our plans for intercontinental bomber production.

I also express my appreciation to the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] who steered the money necessary for this announced step-up through the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee; and to the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who did the same in the full committee and also to the invariably gracious and understanding assistance of the majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas.

In my opinion, these actions insure greater security for the United States, although they will not reflect themselves in operational aircraft for a long time to come.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article prepared for the Reporter magazine, and entitled "The Growing Power of the Soviet Air Force," written by Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, United States Army, retired, military analyst of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GROWING POWER OF THE SOVIET AIR FORCE

(By Thomas R. Phillips)

One of the first real showdowns between the administration and the opposition may come soon on the issue of our competitive position in airpower vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, and whether it is to be determined by military or by budgetary considerations.

Popular respect for President Eisenhower as a military expert has made it politically difficult for his critics in either party to stand against the President's military recommendations. Their present access of courage is the result of Soviet aircraft demonstrations in practice flights for the last May Day celebration. (Due the bad weather the flybys could not be carried out on May Day itself this year.) These practice flights, together with later public demonstrations plus other intelligence, indicate, alarmingly, that the Soviet Union has surpassed the United States in the development of interceptors—defensive aircraft—and is rapidly drawing abreast in medium and heavy jet bombers—the means of delivery of nuclear weapons.

It is probable that today, in the words of Sir Winston Churchill, the United States and the Soviet Union have reached the point of saturation in thermonuclear weapons. This, Sir Winston explained, "means the point where, although one power is stronger than the other—perhaps much stronger—both are capable of inflicting crippling or quasi-mortal injury on the other."

When the point of saturation in weapons is reached the arms race shifts from the weapons themselves to the means of delivering them and the defense against them. The Soviet shows have demonstrated, according to our experts, that the Russians are ahead of the United States in the design and construction of large jet and turboprop engines and of interceptors, and that they have matched us in the design of medium and heavy bombers and in getting heavy bombers into production.

In spite of American skill in production, the Russians have a supersonic interceptor in combat formations while we have none; they have thousands of transsonic interceptors in combat formations while the United States has a few hundred; they started 2 years later than we to make a jet intercontinental bomber and now have it in formations while we don't; they have developed jet engines which, when first shown a year ago, had about twice the thrust of anything developed in the West; they have built more jet aircraft of a single type—the MIG–15—than we have of all jet aircraft combined; and have built more light two-engined jet bombers than all the free world put together. While the United States concentrated on jet engines and neglected turboprops, the Russians have developed both simultaneously. At the same time that the Soviets were involved in crash programs for medium and heavy bombers, they also had crash programs on long-range missiles. The United States, in contrast, completely dropped its intercontinental ballistic missile for 2 years and was progressing at a leisurely pace until Soviet progress forced a top priority on our missile program.

DEFENSE COVERUP

These are shocking facts, but they are not really fresh news. The Air Force has been aware of them for a long time, and much has been public for at least a year. What has made it bad, however, is that the Defense Department has tried to cover up. The practice flights over Moscow for the May Day celebration were seen by millions of Russians and thousands of foreigners. The aircraft flew low and anyone could photograph them and deduce their characteristics. According to Hanson W. Baldwin of the New York Times, the Defense Department, in order to head off criticism of the administration defense program by Members of the Senate, put out a press release May 13 that was terse to the point of obscurity. Baldwin said it had been cleared at the highest level—meaning the White House. It gave no specific information nor did it go into the implications of the Soviet show. It merely concluded that this was "evidence of the modern technology of the Soviet aircraft industry and the advances which are being made by them."

If the release was intended to quiet criticism of the Defense Department's air program, it failed signally. Detailed information on the Soviet display was published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the magazine Aviation Week. European publications printed informed interpretations about what the Russians had shown. Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, Missouri, used the confusing press release as an example to justify his demand for a Senate inquiry into the state of the military program.

Eleven days later at a news conference, Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson released a new statement of what had been seen in Moscow. This was not complete either. In it the Department admitted that "the Soviets displayed several models of modern jet bombers and fighters. They displayed more than 50 new supersonic day fighters and more than 30 new all-weather fighters, both in operational numbers. They displayed more than 40 new medium bombers, known for the first time last year as a prototype. They showed at least 9 new aircraft powered with turboprops, the first time they have displayed aircraft so powered. They displayed 10 or more long-range heavy bombers after showing just 1 last year. This is comparable to our own B-52 which we are producing."

There is one error in the Secretary's statement quoted above. The medium bomber was not known as a prototype last year. A formation of nine was flown at the May Day celebration in 1954. Therefore the bomber was in quantity production and in combat formations a year ago.

There is another rather doubtful statement in the release. Secretary Wilson quoted the President as saying at his most recent news conference: "It is just not true" that we no longer have air superiority. What the President actually said was: "To say that we have lost in a twinkling all of this great technical development and technical excellence as well as the numbers in our total aircraft is just not true."

WHAT THE DISPLAY MEANT

Where does the United States stand in relation to the Soviets in air power? The U. S. S. R.'s first outstanding achievement was the MIG–15, a subsonic jet interceptor for defense against the American intercontinental B–36. Fifteen thousand were manufactured between 1948 and 1952, with production reaching 450 a month at one time. The United States and Canada have built about 6,000 of the comparable United States F–86 Saberjet.

In 1952, production of the MIG–15 was stopped and the larger MIG–17 was put into

production. The MIG–17 is an interceptor capable of speeds just below that of sound in level flight and of supersonic speed in dives. About 7,000 of the MIG–17 have been produced and more than 4,000 are now in combat formations in the Soviet Union. Production is believed to be more than 300 a month. In the United States the manufactured total of the comparable F–100's, or Supersabers, is in the low hundreds, and fewer than a hundred of them are in combat formations.

The 50 new Russian supersonic fighters noted in the Secretary of Defense's press release have 60 degree swept-back wings. The display of such numbers meant that they are in assembly-line production and in combat formations. In the United States the comparable aircraft are still in the prototype-and-testing stage. From the observed characteristics of the Soviet supersonic fighter, it is not possible to judge its performance exactly. It is believed to be below that of the 1,000-mile-an-hour F–101.

The formation of 30 new all-weather fighters was as much of a shock as the supersonic day fighter. They have thin, straight wings and a solid radome nose. Performance is estimated to exceed that of the Lockheed F–94C Starfire but to be below the supersonic all-weather F–102. The latter, however, is still in the testing stage.

A new turboprop aircraft with counter-rotating propellers was displayed in a formation of nine. It is not known whether these are tankers, bombers, or long-range reconnaissance aircraft. The United States has a requirement for this type of aircraft for tankers and transports and is developing it. But again it will not be in use for some time, while the Soviet aircraft are now in combat inventory.

The Russians displayed 40 or 50 of their Type 39 (Badger) medium bomber. This two-engined jet bomber is comparable in performance to the American six-engined B–47. When the big jet engines were first seen in flight a year ago, western designers, who had been unable to produce anything comparable, found it hard to believe that the Russians had succeeded. These engines had twice the thrust (18,000 to 20,000 pounds) of any jet engines then in production in the West. The larger engine is more economical of fuel than several smaller engines producing equivalent power. The rate of production of the Badger is not known but is believed to be substantial. It will replace the TU–4, a copy of the American B–29, as a threat against Europe and our peripheral air bases.

THE B–47 GAMBLE

Since 1948 the United States has built about 1,500 of the B–47 medium bombers. It is the B–47 that accounts for American superiority in air power. Its 3,000-mile range, which can be doubled by in-flight refueling, exposes the entire surface of the Soviet Union to attack from our forward bases. The B–47 was no accident. It was ordered into production in 1948 by Secretary of the Air Force SYMINGTON without long testing and modification in prototype stage. As a result the first 300 had to undergo modifications. It was not until after more than 700 had been built that all the changes found necessary in service use had been incorporated in the assembly lines. The modification of the B–47 cost more than $300 million dollars. But if this wasteful haste had not been adopted, we might be now little better off than the Soviet Union in medium bombers. Instead, 80 percent of the medium wings of the Strategic Air Command are now equipped with them. This is the bomb carrier that carries the air-atomic power of the United States, while the aging B–36 is being replaced by the jet B–52.

The Russian four-engined jet heavy bomber, the Type 37 (or Bison) was shown in prototype at the May Day celebration a year ago. Two formations, 1 of 10 and 1 of 8, were seen this year. It was believed to have entered into production last year and is probably now going into combat formations. About 30 of the comparable American B–52 have been built. None are yet in squadron service.

THE MEN WHO FLY

In summary, the Russians are behind us in medium bombers and approximately equal to us in intercontinental jet bombers and all-weather fighters. They surpass us in nearly all other types of military aircraft. But we are still not inferior in the air. Superiority consists in more than numbers and superior performance of aircraft. The MIG–15 in the Korean war was superior to the F–86 Sabre at higher altitudes and inferior at lower. The 12-to-1 difference in kills in combat cannot be accounted for by the difference in performance. It was due to the skill and training of the American pilots and superior gunsights.

The Russians have no organization remotely comparable in training and experience to the United States Strategic Air Command. The relative effectivesess between Soviet and American long-range bombers should be in about the same ratio as our superiority in fighters in Korea. The United States also benefits offensively and defensively from its geographic position and its peripheral bases. Whereas every Soviet attack on the United States must be intercontinental, most American attacks on the Soviet Union can be from nearer bases. One plane from a near base can make twice as many raids as from a distant base and hence is the equivalent in effectiveness of two planes working from intercontinental bases.

But after conceding all this, the Soviet advances in aircraft production and design are of grave significance. The new Soviet interceptors, especially the all-weather (night) interceptor, make the American intercontinental B–36 obsolete. It has been admitted for some time that the B–36 probably would not be able to operate over hostile territory in daytime without serious losses. It has been thought that it could operate at night. The new Soviet all-weather interceptor, once in adequate inventory, ends even the prospect of nighttime operations. It was because of this obvious conclusion that the Secretary of Defense asked Congress to make available $356 million to speed up the production of the jet intercontinental B–52. Production will be increased 35 percent. This means that the replacement of the B–36 by the B–52 will be hastened, but at present there has been no decision to increase the number of heavy-bomber wings.

BOMBERS VERSUS FIGHTERS

It is expectable that the new Soviet supersonic interceptors would greatly increase the predictable losses of B–52 and B–47 bombers in case of a war. At one time the Air Force planned to use a formation of 10 to 15 planes to carry 1 bomb. Part of these were to engage in diversionary tactics to draw off enemy fighters, others would have been loaded with equipment for radar countermeasures. The reduction in weight of this equipment and the high performance of the B–52 and B–47 led to plans for every bomber to have a bombing mission. With the Soviet advance in fighters, the Strategic Air Command might have to go back to large defensive formations. This, together with the greater losses to be expected, would require greater numbers of aircraft than are now contemplated. The administration has not faced up to this problem yet.

The bomber-fighter relationship needs to be turned around and looked at with the United States on the receiving end. The Soviet Union is now producing high-performance intercontinental jet bombers, and should have them in large numbers within 2 years. The United States, in contrast to the Soviet Union, does not have the supersonic all-weather and day fighters in combat units. The United States Continental Air Defense Command would have to meet, if war came, high-performance jet bombers with fighters and interceptors with performances only marginally superior to that of the invading craft.

CONTRASTING APPROACHES

The average American with confidence and pride in our industrial skill finds it hard to believe that the Russians can outdesign and outproduce us in any field. How did it come about? Why are the Russians able to compress the time between design and mass production more than we? For example, the United States started on the B–52 in 1948. It was first tested in 1952, and first production came in the spring of 1954. The comparable Soviet type 37 was designed in 1950, first tested in 1953, and first produced in 1954. They gained between 2 and 3 years on the United States in making a heavy jet bomber although we had experience and production facilities for heavy aircraft that the Soviet Union did not have.

There are a number of reasons for our lag. One is the present business approach to production in the Pentagon. The businessman likes a nice, economical routine. This is laudable and proper if the competition is mild as in banking but it can be disastrous if the competition is for survival.

The entirely business approach would not tolerate such expense as was required to get the B–47 into early production. But that wasteful and courageous decision on the B–47 is the single reason that the United States still has an edge over the Soviet in the air. It would be nice to test and test and test until a perfect prototype of a new aircraft has been made. But the plane would be obsolete when it was ready for production. It would be like ordering today a 1958 Cadillac to be delivered in 1960. We are doing exactly that in permitting the Russians to have a cycle from design to production 2 years shorter than ours.

It is American practice to build 1 or 2 prototypes, handmade versions, and to use 1 or 2 test pilots. The testing period could be greatly reduced if as many as 10 prototypes were produced and a number of test pilots were used.

DELAYS IN LEAD TIME

The business approach in the Pentagon created a serious delay in lead time when it stopped the issuance of letters of intent to contract to the producers. By letters of intent the Air Force was able to start the producer as soon as the money was appropriated. It now takes 8 to 10 months to decide on a type and award and complete a contract. Today there is this needless delay in getting started on new production.

Another problem is the decision-making and budget cycle. The budget for 1957 is now being started. Today the Air Force may not know which new designs it wants to put into prototype and which new aircraft in the testing stage it may want to produce. The decisions have to be made in some cases after the budget has gone to Congress. The yearly budget itself tends toward yearly decisions. In the Soviet Union there is no such cycle. Decisions can be made at any time and once made production is all-out. Stalin decided on the MIG–15 and almost the entire Soviet aviation industry concentrated on it. This was the largest and fastest expansion of airpower in postwar history.

Another delay in lead time can be debited to the present administration. It prevented expansion of personnel in the Air Force while the numbers of wings were still expanding. One "saving" was in the elimination of transition and final combat-crew training in the Training Command of the Air Force. Combat units, when they get new aircraft, now have to do both transition

and combat crew training themselves. Had the Training Command not been cut, the crews would have been trained by it, ready when the new aircraft became available.

It has required an enormous effort for the Soviet Union to pull ahead of the United States in the aviation industry. The effort has been promoted in successive 5-year plans since 1928. At the same time the Russians have vastly increased their scientific and technical training. According to Ramsay D. Potts, Jr., in the May issue of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science: "While the United States has been turning out far more university graduates, the Soviets between 1928 and 1953 have graduated 150,000 more engineers than the United States. In 1928 the Soviets had some 26 institutions offering engineering training. Today there are approximately 175 schools offering training in engineering exclusively. Their enrollment numbers about 300,000 students. By comparison, some 210 United States colleges offer engineering courses with an enrollment of about 194,000 students. * * * Since 1951 the Soviets have been graduating at least 1,200 to 1,400 aeronautical engineers per year. In 1954 the United States graduated 645 aeronautical engineers. The quality of Soviet instruction is very high by United States standards; the students get considerably more education in the general sciences, and especially in mathematics."

THE DOLLAR IN POWER

The Soviet Union, as Senator SYMINGTON avers, is in the process of surpassing the United States in aircraft quality. For several years it has been ahead in quantity. But as long as the administration refuses to admit this and fails to do anything about it, there is little chance that the United States will regain its lead. On May 24 Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Roger Lewis at a news conference with the Secretary of Defense said in answer to a question: "I would say in terms of airplanes that can do the job—the fighting job—in the quality of airplanes, I think we have not only qualitative superiority but quantitative superiority."

From the figures given above it can be seen that this is not true as to quality except for the B–47. As to quantity, the Soviet Union has for some years maintained about 20,000 aircraft in combat formations and about 20,000 in reserve. The United States has about 13,000 aircraft in combat formations in the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps and a total inventory of all types from one-seaters on up of about 39,000. The figures to be compared, however, are the aircraft in combat formations. Here the United States total is deceptive. Half the aircraft on naval carriers exists only to defend the carriers. Marine aviation is tied to ground units so closely that it is of only limited use. In the air battle Navy carriers do not stay in one place long and hence naval aviation can give only limited yield in sustained combat as compared to land-based aircraft.

What has happened to our relative position in air power cannot be reversed overnight. We should be going into production of supersonic medium and heavy bombers right now and should have been producing supersonic fighters for at least a year. Instead we are years away.

We shall probably acquire a belated sense of urgency in the next year, and as our margin of leadership vanishes indulge again in crash programs in an effort to catch up. In the meantime our relative position will grow worse for at least 2 or 3 years. It will take that long for a sense of urgency today to have an effect on production of advanced aircraft. The "new look" in the Pentagon 2 years ago was a look at the defense dollar and not at defense needs. The dollar is still in power. As a result we are again in the old cycle, decried by the President, of feast and famine in the Armed Forces. The economies of the past 2 years soon will have to be erased by new expansions because the "new look" peered in the wrong direction.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Soviet Now Calls Surprise Key Factor in Nuclear War," written by Harry Schwartz, and published in the New York Times of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET NOW CALLS SURPRISE KEY FACTOR IN NUCLEAR WAR

(By Harry Schwartz)

A new emphasis on the importance of surprise attack in the age of nuclear weapons is being openly disseminated by Soviet military leaders in the Soviet press. The concept that such an attack by planes or guided missiles delivering atomic and hydrogen weapons may be decisive in war is apparently being incorporated in Soviet strategic doctrine.

This new emphasis on surprise attack and on the Soviet Union's ability to use it is a key point in recent articles by Marshall Alexander M. Vasilevsky, Deputy Defense Minister; Marshal Pavel A. Rotmistrov, chief of tank troops, and other Soviet military figures.

Coming in a period when the Soviet Union has demonstrated its possession of significant numbers of intercontinental jet bombers, the articles appear aimed at two goals: To readjust the thinking of Soviet military men to the new Soviet long-range attack capabilities and to warn the West that the Soviet Union will not hesitate to use its long-range bombers for blows on foreign soil if it deems it necessary to do so.

Marshal Rotmistrov and others writing in this vein quote with approval Lenin's statement that "an army would behave foolishly or even criminally if it did not prepare itself to master every kind of weapon, every means and device of warfare that is or can be used by the enemy."

The warning to the West is most explicit in a recent article by Lt. Gen. S. S. Shatilov, deputy chief of the Main Political Administration of the Ministry of Defense. He warns the "generals and admirals of the imperialist camp" to remember that "atomic weapons, and equally surprise acts, are double-edged weapons."

A major article spread over two pages of the Soviet Army newspaper Krasnaya Zvezda assails some of our military comrades who think only in defensive terms as victims of narrowminded, pacifist ideology. Soviet disclaimers of aggressive intent, the article continues, do not mean that in case of attack Soviet armed forces cannot transfer military activities to the territory of the enemy, cannot strike and destroy the aggressors everywhere, on whatever territory they are to be found.

That modern weapons have resulted in a change of Soviet military doctrine is indicated most explicitly by Marshal Rotmistrov. He attacks Soviet writings on military science for ignoring the importance of surprise attack under modern conditions and stressing only the old line that the permanently existing factors decide the fate of war. In Soviet parlance the "permanently existing factors" are such matters as a nation's economic strength and the state of its morale.

He adds: "The imperialist aggressors count on winning victories over the peace-loving states by means of surprise attack. This means that we must not passively react to this kind of military cadres with general considerations, but must seriously, with all conviction, reveal the growing role of surprise attack and raise the vigilance and fighting readiness of the entire personnel composition of the army, air force, and fleet."

As part of the new stress on the importance of surprise attack, General Shatilov demands that Soviet writers give an honest account of the confusion, chaos, and defeat suffered by the Soviet Union in 1941 following Hitler's attack. He accuses them of having presented an idealized picture of this period as one of active defense proceeding along planned lines, a picture he indicates is completely untrue.

Marshal Rotmistrov, General Shatilov, and other writers also demand a new attitude and respect for bourgeois military science. They call for recognition of the fact that the capitalist world can make advances that Soviet military men must know, and they condemn disdain for, and ignorance of, military thinking outside the Soviet bloc. They suggest that past undue depreciation of western military achievements and ability has tended to result in a complacent attitude dangerous for the Soviet Union.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Some of us are earnestly opposed to these planned further reductions in the military strength of the United States—and these are the reasons why:

Permanent world peace can only become a real hope provided some formula for disarmament and effective procedures to achieve such a goal, are developed.

All of us are certain ultimate success in this field depends upon the free world being able to participate in any such negotiations from a position of adequate military strength.

The history of the Communists, along with their recent rapid conquests, prove that all these ambitious atheists really respect is power.

We should be vary careful, therefore, about any plans for further unilateral disarmament, because as of now this country is the only country left which may be capable of successfully resisting the military strength of the Communists.

As the so-called theory of neutralism develops in many lands during this hydrogen age, we should also give careful consideration to the reaction among our allies and would-be allies, with respect to further military reductions by this country.

At the end of World War II America had developed the atomic bomb, along with the ability to deliver it against any possible enemy.

During the 5 years after the war we reduced our military strength, because at first we had confidence in our Communist allies. When that confidence began to appear misplaced, we were still nevertheless confident our known supremacy in this air-atomic power would prevent any attack.

In this belief we were wrong.

In June of that year the Communists attacked in Korea.

Just prior to the Korean war, one of the most influential voices for limited armament was the former Chief of Staff of the Army, then president of Columbia University, General Eisenhower.

This is important, because everyone I talked with who voted recently in committee for these further heavy reductions in certain parts of our military strength explained his vote on the

grounds President Eisenhower had approved these cuts in the interest of our economy.

But should we blindly trust the Eisenhower record in this matter?

Let us look at some of that record.

On March 29, 1950, less than 3 months before the Communists attacked in Korea, testifying before a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, General Eisenhower said:

Out of my personal regard for the economy of the country, I have strongly urged that that figure ($15 billion) not be exceeded. I believe we could work out an effective defense at that level.

This belief could not have been more wrong. Within a matter of weeks the Communists attacked in Korea; and soon the administration was asking of the Congress—and getting from the Congress—$60 billion annually instead of $15 billion.

In passing, I think it is worth while to note that the cost of the Korean war to the American taxpayer is estimated in a study made by the Library of Congress to have been more than $150 billion.

Now let us look at General Eisenhower's record with respect to air power. On that same day, before the same Senate committee, less than 3 months before Korea, he said:

I then considered, and I still consider, that in the world situation, 48 well-equipped Regular groups, and some dozen, in the National Guard, would be probably a safe minimum.

But he was wrong again, as many of us felt, and stated, at that time.

Shortly thereafter came the Communist attack, and the administration asked for—and obtained—a doubling of National Guard air strength; and a tripling of Regular Air Force strength.

Let me read another excerpt from that same hearing, just before the Korean war, in which we suffered 137,051 casualties:

Senator SALTONSTALL. You believe that this committee should take the responsibility, and the Congress should take the responsibility, to the utmost of its understanding, to keep the military budget within $15 billion, including stockpiling, but perhaps cutting down some of the other items where the military tell us we should go forward a little faster than perhaps we want to?

General EISENHOWER. If you will allow me to testify in the capacity of a private citizen instead of a soldier, because I do not think that, otherwise, I should address you on what you should do with the money level, I do believe just that. I believe that within that amount, you can do it.

Within that level we most certainly could not do it, as the record proves.

The record is sad from the standpoint of the Air Force—but it is no better with respect to the Army, and Navy, and Marines.

Listen to this, from the same hearing:

Chairman MCKELLAR. Did you feel that $13.2 billion overall budget was not enough?

General EISENHOWER. Well, I testified not long ago before a committee of the House, and I told them that somewhere in the level looking toward $14 billion, I still believed, for military purposes, there was the possibility of meeting most of our situation pretty well. I believe we are fairly well on the line, the proper line between economy and security.

And then the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] asked this question in that hearing—again, less than 3 months before Korea:

Senator MCCLELLAN. * * * Based on your present judgment with respect to the current health and soundness of our economy, your opinion regarding the threat or imminence of war, or lack of such threat or imminence of war, and taking into account our present military strength, and the attitude and the policies and the preparation being made, and the military strength that is now being maintained by our potential enemies, do you consider our budget proposal for expenditures for national defense for 1951 adequate, and if not, how much would you add to it in appropriations?

General EISENHOWER. Subject to the conditions I imposed a few minutes ago, sir, that it was a guess because I have not studied these things in detail, I believe there are certain features that I should say would cost us—I will give you a guess, because that is all it is—I would say I would add $500 million to the present budget, as I understand it now, but I would be determined to stay somewhere below the $15 billion which always, in my own mind, has represented the maximum, and I would be determined to stay well below that.

No one in this country has greater respect for General Eisenhower than I have, but in this particular case, along with many other people, he was wrong, because in a few weeks after this testimony we were at war.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. May I yield on the time of the other side, in order to save time for this side?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. THYE. I have only one question. I do not believe it will require more than I minute.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Minnesota for a question.

Mr. THYE. My question is this: Could the diplomatic decision and the orders of the President withdrawing the fleet from the Korean area have indicated that we were not concerned with Korea, and could not such action well have encouraged the invasion of a part of North Korea, inspired by the Communists?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I will answer my good friend from Minnesota in this way. I do not know how many more people made errors. I do know, however, that almost daily General Eisenhower was in contact with the Secretary of Defense and almost weekly with the President of the United States with respect to the world problems.

Mr. THYE. I am sure that as president of a university, as President Eisenhower was at that time, he would not have been giving directions and making recommendations with respect to orders for the fleet, and so forth, as he would be as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I am in search of an answer to these questions, because I want to be in the position of assisting to furnish this Nation the defense which I believe it should have and must have.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In the budgets of the Pentagon, the three plans were called "Ike 1," "Ike 2," and "Ike 3," which shows in what close contact the distinguished president of Columbia University was with the Secretary of Defense. I am not saying that more than one person did not make mistakes, or vice versa.

As I did say, within a few weeks of this testimony we were at war, and within a few months the relatively unprepared military forces of the United States suffered the worst defeat in the history of our country.

Based on this record, is it right for us to follow blindly the present request for even further reductions in our military strength?

Smarting under the defeat in 1951 to which I have just referred, the Joint Chiefs of Staff came up with a new plan, one designed for the security of the United States, and based on the new knowledge of the Communist strength. That plan was inaugurated, and was being put into effect as rapidly as possible until the present administration took office.

As soon as President Eisenhower came into office, in the interest of economy the plan was promptly scrapped, by a new and totally inexperienced Secretary of Defense.

More than $7 billion was cut from the funds requested by the services, including over $5 billion from the Air Force. I might add at this point that most of the Air Force money has now been replaced, at great cost of money and time to the American people.

Before these cuts were made there was no discussion with the then Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Gen. Omar Bradley, publicly announced his disagreement with the new policy, when he wrote that we had started to coast before we reached the top of the hill.

And we have been coasting down, to save money, every day until the recent incredible display of air power by the Soviet last month.

During 1953, many persons in high places in this administration devoted much time to warning that Indochina must be saved at all cost. So the Congress agreed to the request for over a billion dollars more to be spent in that country, and that billion was lost at the fall of Dien Bien Phu.

This was the period in which we first created, and then abandoned, such word weapons as massive retaliation.

Also during 1953, 1954, and now 1955, we continued, and are continuing, to cut our miiltary strength heavily. And now in the Senate it is again requested that we approve heavy reductions in our Army and Marine Corps—these reductions to take effect during the fiscal year 1956.

As a former businessman, holding to the theory, as the Chinese say, that a picture is worth a thousand words, I call the attention of Senators to the

charts which are now on display in the rear of the Chamber. The first chart shows what has happened to the Air Force in recent years. At the beginning of the chart is shown the condition in which we were just prior to the beginning of the Korean war. The line shows what happened, as we move along to the top figure on the chart. Then, we started to reduce, cutting the $21 billion figure almost in half. The next year it went up a little, and the following year some more. Based on what is happening, we will again have to put that figure up somewhat higher.

From the standpoint of business and business experience, everyone knows that the ideal line is a straight line, because each time there is a change, up or down, it means that thousands of men must be occupied in changing millions of records, at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars to the taxpayers. That is the result of what we call reprograming. Probably there is no organization in the world which understands reprograming better than the military service.

Now let us look at the Army chart. It starts with the figure $4.4 billions at the bottom of the chart. Then it goes up to $19.6 billions, and then to $21.3 billions. Then the trend is sharply downward: $15.2, $12.8, $7.8, and $7.3 billions. This trend also will undoubtedly have to be reversed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Now let us look at the Navy chart. We note that the line goes up, down, up, down. Finally we have an overall chart which shows the damaging influence of all these changes, instead of the steady line we understood we would have in this administration. The last chart shows the combined figures for the three services together.

For the third straight year, therefore, despite the lesson of Korea, this administration is demanding further heavy reductions in our ground forces.

As stated, these reductions go squarely against previous recommendations of General Eisenhower's right arm in Europe, General Bradley. They also go against recent statements by General Gruenther, head of SHAPE.

On March 15 last in London in a talk widely published in the British press but not reported in a single newspaper in this country, General Gruenther said:

> I desire to emphasize that there is no evidence to justify the hope that (under atomic warfare) there will be a decrease in the numbers of men and equipment now considered necessary for the defense of the NATO territory. * * * The size of the unit and the tactics it employs will not reduce the overall land force requirements.

In an interview last February, Lieutenant General Gavin replied to the question whether the Army would need more men for the atomic battlefield, or fewer, by stating:

> Certainly not fewer, quite possibly more, almost certainly more.

General Matthew Ridgway stated his position before our committee. Now he is leaving the post of Chief of Staff of the Army, but he completely confirmed the position of his colleagues that the dispersion and mobility necessary in possible modern peripheral or nuclear war will require at least as many ground troops as have been necessary in previous wars.

For less than 10 percent of the money now being requested for foreign aid, the 109,000 trained troops scheduled to be eliminated next year could be retained.

In that connection, again speaking directly to the amendment, for less than 2 percent of that foreign aid, we could hold in service 22,000 Marine Regulars, every one of whom is a volunteer.

I believe in proper foreign aid, and in the vital importance of allies, and only use this illustration to show how relatively small—$329 million—is the amount which would be saved by discharging these 109,000 Army and Marine veterans at this time.

Let me emphasize that until now neither I nor, to the best of my knowledge, any other Member of the Senate has asked that Air Force appropriations be increased in the fiscal year 1956. But an attempt has been made to justify the proposed ground force reductions on the basis of a degree of Air Force supremacy which the now released truth shows conclusively is not true.

In that connection, I should like to say that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], has in his possession a letter from the Department of the Air Force which states that they have the money with which to increase the production of fighter planes, and will do so when they consider it necessary. Of course the production of fighter planes should be increased, because fighter planes are used against bombers, not bombers against fighter planes, and therefore the production of fighter planes should be increased. In view of that statement in the letter, although I have prepared an amendment in connection with the production of fighter planes, I shall not offer it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it was my purpose to submit the letter at the appropriate time. My reason for opposing one of the amendments of the Senator from Missouri was shown by the statement made a few moments ago by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], with respect to unobligated balances, both in the Army and in the Air Force. In this particular instance the Air Force has $3,350,000,000 in unobligated funds. That was one of the reasons why the chairman of the subcommittee did not feel he could agree to appropriations of new money for the Air Force at this time.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. I believe he is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Air Force has $3,350,000,000 left.

Mr. WILEY. In appropriated funds?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Appropriated already and unobligated.

Mr. SYMINGTON. What we have asked for is that the American people be given the facts with respect to overall relative strength—our strength as against that of the Communists; and more specifically, the quantities of planes and the characteristics of the planes forming those quantities which were flown and reflown, in various formations, over Moscow last May.

Everybody in Moscow, including all residents of foreign embassies, had the opportunity to see the formations in question, and to photograph them.

A part of the truth about these flights was later confirmed by the Department of Defense, after more complete facts had been published in the press.

All of us know that partial truth is an evasion of truth.

Even as of today, however, the photographs of these planes have never been declassified and released to the American people, although in a press conference the Secretary of Defense might have been considered to have implied that said photographs would be released.

The request for more money to speed up the production of the long-range B–52's was made by the Department of Defense only after Senate Committees demanded the facts, and an authoritative magazine had released available details about the Moscow flights.

Could it be that one of the reasons this information was held back from the public was knowledge that additional money would almost automatically have to be asked for if the truth became known?

Many people have asked why, now that bomber production is to be increased, fighter production is not increased. The Communists are further ahead of us in the production of modern jet fighters than they are in modern intercontinental jet bombers, and fighters, not bombers, defend against bombers.

A reporter for an authoritative magazine said only last week that the Russian members of the Soviet team which recently spent a week inspecting United States and Canadian aircraft and engines on display at the Canadian International Trade Fair, stated that in the near future air demonstration over Moscow will display aeronautical models even more advanced than those seen over that city in May.

The Communists added:

> Compare what you see here in Canada with what we will show you later in Moscow, that will indicate the progress of our industry.

This statement was made during the month of June, an indication there are more Communist developments to come.

Whether or not the Communists have passed us in the engineering of most models, one thing is sure, they are getting production of their new models, and we are not.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is it not a fact that although a great deal of money has been spent for fighter defense, we have never been able to receive any assurance that no matter how much we spend we can prevent enemy bombers from reaching this country? I believe that while the Senator from Missouri was Secretary of the Air Force, he made an estimate that we could intercept only approximately 30 percent.

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is a great deal of merit in what the Senator says, and I appreciate his comment.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator give us any assurance that if we appropriated twice or three times what we are appropriating, we could prevent any more bombers from getting through?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The answer very possibly is, "No," especially as there is no known defense, even in theory, against the intercontinental atomic missile.

If the planned cuts in ground troops for 1956 were made on the basis of an air supremacy which the Moscow demonstration last month proves we do not now have, then how can these reductions be justified?

How can anyone argue against a reappraisal, and a postponement in the proposed reductions at least until that reappraisal has been completed?

Consider that, despite our worldwide commitments, our planned mobile combat forces are tens of thousands of troops smaller than the little army of South Korea, or the army of North Korea, or the Chinese Communist army stationed in North Korea; and millions less than the army of the Soviet Communists, or the army of the Chinese Communists.

On that basis, how can we plan to further reduce our own mobile divisions to 13?

Now that we know the Communists have both the hydrogen and atomic bombs, plus the capacity for intercontinental delivery, what capability for decisive strategic deterrence on the part of our Air Force is left?

Even when we had that power of deterrence, and the Communists did not, they attacked in Korea, and attacked in Indochina, and may well attack in the Formosa area.

This condition becomes even more true if we are as far behind in the development and production of what may be the ultimate weapon—the intercontinental ballistic missile—as so many of us think we are today.

I again ask, if these reductions were exactly right before we had the recent shocking revelations of additional Soviet air strength, how can they be exactly right now?

Before any further cuts of any kind are made in our Military Establishment, should we not reexamine our entire estimated relative strength as against the strength of the Communists?

"Relative" is the important word, because the fact that we are stronger today than in any other period of uneasy peace means exactly nothing.

Here is a rough accounting of our relative strength. The present plan is for the United States to have 15 combat Army divisions. Of these, 13 will be mobile. The Soviet Communists have 175 army divisions. The Chinese Communists between 200 and 400. Therefore the decrepancy against the United States is somewhere between 375 to 15 and 575 to 15. These figures do not include satellite armies of the Communists, or allied armies of the free world. On the surface of the sea the United States is supreme. Under the sea the Communists are far ahead. Secretary Thomas has announced the number of their submarines to be 375, which is far more than any country ever had in the world's history. Consider what these undersea craft might do to our lifelines all over the world.

Justification for further cuts next year in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, are now given by this administration on the basis of our air supremacy. But that supremacy is becoming more and more questionable.

Of the 5 chief categories of airpower—fighters, light bombers, medium bombers, heavy bombers, and missiles—the Soviet is ahead in 2, probably ahead in 2 more. The United States is ahead in one.

We are now told by the Department of Defense that the Soviet Communists have manufactured, and have in operation units, thousands more modern jet fighters than have the United States and the entire free world combined.

We are also told that the Soviet Communists have manufactured, and have in operation units, thousands more modern light jet bombers than the United States and the entire free world combined possess.

We have hundreds more modern medium size bombers than the Communists.

Latest knowledge would tend to show that the Communists have passed us in the production of modern long-range jet intercontinental bombers. Recently they had more flying in one display over Moscow then we have in operational units.

Any extrapolation based on facts convinces us the Communists are ahead in the missile field—well ahead with the intercontinental ballistic missile, the ultimate weapon at least in our time.

That is the accounting, the balance sheet.

Survival is more important than money.

Only recently we again lowered our guard. As a consequence the American people were forced to put up over $150 billion to pay for the Korean war which resulted.

But we still have the richest economy in the history of the world—after taxes.

In any case, why save money by taking it out of the Army and Marines if there are other places, to economize? And there are other places.

For many years some of us have been on record as urging that true unification would save a tremendous amount in the budget of the Department of Defense.

Instead of attacking the problem from the standpoint of proper management under true unification, however, this administration is now building a bureaucratic empire in the Pentagon unparalleled in the history of our Government.

In January, 1946, I went to the Pentagon as Assistant Secretary of War for Air. At that time there were 4 Secretaries in the Pentagon and 4 more across the river in the Navy Department—a total of 8 in the defense structure. That number, now considered so totally inadequate, nevertheless was enough to fight and win the greatest war in the history of the world.

The so-called unification law of 1947 was passed. It resulted in 4 departments instead of the previous 2 or the desired 1—exactly the opposite of the declared purpose of the bill. Now the number of secretaries has grown to the incredible figure of 31.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senate now increases the number of personnel and the amount of money for the Department, they are likely to have 50 secretaries, are they not?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I will come to that very shortly, if the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico will bear with me.

A recent talk made by an expert on the Unification Act included the following statement:

As the program seller says when you go to the ball park, "You can't tell the players without a program," so, by way of summing up—

There are a total of 31 officials within the Department of Defense who can be properly addressed as "Mr. Secretary."

Since I resigned as Assistant Secretary of Defense more than 4 years ago when there was only one "Mr. Secretary" at the Defense level, the Secretary of Defense himself—I hope you will understand why I enjoy this recital of some of the fruits of the economy program—for the Department of Defense.

One of the high officials of the Department of Defense was recently giving a speech in New York. In the course of the speech he referred proudly to the large number of civil-service employees dismissed since Charles Wilson became Secretary of Defense.

I am told former Secretary of the Air Force Finletter, who was in the audience, when called upon for comment at the conclusion of the speech, remarked that the reduction of civil-service employees would have been quite impressive—had it not been for the apparent policy of replacing each laid-off employee with an Assistant Secretary.

I would like to give you my views, for whatever value they may have, concerning the present setup with all of its "operating vice presidents" and "functional vice presidents"—including, I should add, the numerous Deputies and Assistants who revolve, like satellites, around all of these "vice presidents."

I think that there are so many of these "vice presidents" and "deputy and assistant vice presidents" that the organization is beginning to suffer from the sheer weight of their number. Prompt and decisive action is often prevented by the number of "vice presidents" who must be consulted.

Moreover, various treaties have had to be entered into between some of the Assistant Secretaries of Defense, in an effort to define the respective jurisdictional limits of, say, Assistant Secretary X and Assistant Secretary Y. One such treaty was published recently by the Bureau of National Affairs, and there have been other treaties of a similar nature that have not yet been published.

Let me read to you a single sentence from Secretary Wilson's report of March 31, 1955, to President Eisenhower, to which I referred a few moments ago.

In this report Secretary Wilson states:

"The task of building a stable defense establishment, adequate to meet the requirements of the years ahead and within the economic resources of the Nation, was only started during the past year."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield myself 3 more minutes.

If the project which Secretary Wilson described was, as he puts it, "only started during the past year, "then a lot of us must have been wasting a tremendous amount of time during the preceding 6 years or so.

Now let me read to you the following brief excerpt from testimony before the Woodrum committee by James Forrestal in April of 1944, at a time when Forrestal had been serving for approximately 4 years as Under Secretary of the Navy. In his testimony, Forrestal said:

"Organization charts are very fine things but they are of no value unless human beings, who have to make them work, have the necessary qualifications. Personally, whether in business or government, I would rather let the chart follow experience than the reverse."

This is a quotation from the first Secretary of Defense—an American patriot who quite literally laid down his life through overwork in the service of his country.

That constructive talk indicates where defense money might be saved without further sacrificing the military strength of the Nation.

If this administrative monstrosity were cleaned up at the top by true unification, the unification would extend all through the defense organization—and billions of dollars annually would be saved the American taxpayer.

Many other persons who have had business experience, and who have joined the staff at the Pentagon Building have said the same thing for years.

These times do not justify further unilateral disarmament.

We have committed ourselves to stop Communist aggression, all over the world.

The stated policy of this administration is to rely upon air supremacy and local defenses.

But recent events show we have nothing like the air supremacy to that degree once relied on.

Local defenses in Europe are vastly outnumbered; and from Formosa to Turkey—almost a third of the world—there are no local defenses worthy of the name.

Based on this record, we plead that in the face of these astounding recent Communist engineering and production accomplishments, the Senate approve no further decrease in our military strength and in the Marine Corps as examplified by the evidence given on the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The time of the Senator has almost expired, but I wish to commend him heartily for his devoted and tireless efforts in behalf of the national defense. Particularly I thank him for the very enlightening, informative, and challenging address he has made today.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to join with my colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama, in commending the Senator from Missouri for his "laying it on the line" speech.

Is the Senate to understand, on the basis of the remarks made by the Senator from Missouri, that at present the Soviet Union is ahead of the United States in combat land forces, in undersea craft, in fighter craft in the air, and in bomber craft, with the exception of the B–47 bombers; and that the only phase in which the United States has superiority at present is its surface fleet. Is that the correct way in which to state our position?

Mr. SYMINGTON. If I am correct in understanding his question, I would answer the Senator from Montana by saying that the Soviet Union is far ahead of the United States on the ground and far ahead of us under the sea. The United States is supreme on top of the sea, thanks to the efforts of some of our colleagues now in the Chamber. I am thinking of people like the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], former members of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Nevertheless, in the air we are in much worse relative shape than we were before.

In modern jet fighters, improved fighters over those used in Korea, the Soviet Union is far ahead of us, according to the testimony of representatives of the Department of Defense. In modern light jet bombers, also, the Soviet Union is far ahead of the United States.

In medium bombers, because of the development of the B–47, the United States is well ahead of the Soviet Union.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield myself an additional 2 minutes.

In the matter of modern intercontinental jet bombers, it is a fact that the Soviet Union has recently flown over Moscow more of that type of plane in one formation than the United States has in operation today.

Finally, based on all analysis I can make, and I believe I have full information, the Soviet Union is well ahead of the United States in the intercontinental ballistics field, the field which should cause us the most concern.

I wanted to be careful to state the position in detail, in answering the question asked by the very able Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator. I should say it is a very depressing answer.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I commend the Senator from Missouri for having made what I think is one of the most important and convincing speeches I have listened to in the Senate for a very long time.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am completely in accord with his point of view and his arguments in this matter. During the past 2 or 3 years we have continually assumed many additional obligations in Europe, in Asia, in the Middle East, and in other areas of the world. There can be no doubt whatsoever about that. Yet, simultaneously with the assumption of additional great responsibilities, we have constantly weakened our defenses and lessened our ability to meet the responsibilities which we have assumed and to which we are solemnly committed.

As the Senator from Missouri has so clearly stated, we are weaker today than we should be under the sea, on the land, and in the Marine Corps. There is very grave doubt whether we are continuing to hold our superiority in the air.

To me, it simply does not make sense for the United States, in the face of continuing serious threat, to weaken her defenses by further reductions in armament. I am vigorously opposed to such a policy. I strongly favor the amendment of the Senator from Missouri fixing the strength of our Marine Corps at 215,000 men. I go much further, too, and urge that we maintain the size of our Army and continue to increase very materially the strength and fighting potential of our Air Force. With our present inadequate military force we are threatening with a big stick which does not have the strength to defend us and our freedom.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to express my very deep appreciation to the junior Senator from Missouri for making this very constructive and comprehensive statement. I also appreciate the fact that a substantial number of my colleagues on this side of the aisle heard him state the situation.

I should like to make this observation: Before voting on the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Missouri, an amendment which, if it shall not be adopted, will in effect result in reducing the Marine Corps, which is one of the finest fighting forces any nation ever had, by 22,000 men, I hope every Senator will stop, look, and listen.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am very grateful to the distinguished senior Senator from Texas for those remarks.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to ask the Senator if the only justification which the administration gives for the drastic cuts in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps is a nonexistent Reserve to be organized under a nonexistent law.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would answer the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina in this way: The Reserve program should be enacted; but, to the best of my knowledge, as of this moment the Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I have viewed most of the entire military program as reflected in the pending appropriation bill, which provides for the military program for fiscal 1956. Also in the Committee on Armed Services I have seen unfolded this year most of the major parts of the future military program.

Pending before the Committee on Armed Services for future military construction is an authorization bill which calls for an expenditure of $2.3 billion. Of that amount, $255 million is for military housing alone. Undoubtedly that

is something which is desirable and is needed, but certainly it is something which is not absolutely essential, because our present force is getting along, in a measure, with the housing which is available.

This year Congress will be asked to appropriate for the next fiscal year $330 million for military housing alone. On top of that, we are cutting off 22,000 troops who are trained, ready, and willing to go into action in a matter of hours. Thereby, we shall save only $46 million. With all deference, that simply does not make sense. We are providing money for other programs I have mentioned, and I could continue to illustrate further. One hundred million dollars is provided in one bill simply for reserve tools—machine tools—which we are going to put in reserve for future use. That may be necessary. If so, I shall vote for it. But at the same time it emphasizes the utter fallacy, as I see it—and I cannot see it any other way—of the proposal to take out of circulation—dismembering and liquidating, so to speak—marines who are already trained. If the program goes through without this added appropriation, by the end of fiscal year 1956 we will have reduced the Marine Corps to the bare minimum of the 3 divisions now required by law, without leaving 1 single marine who is presently in service to be used as a replacement, should that be necessary.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does the Senator have time to yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield very briefly.

Mr. BARKLEY. What has it cost the Government of the United States to train the 22,000 marines who will be discharged? In addition to all the other reasons against such reductions, what would we lose by way of expenses already incurred?

Mr. STENNIS. That is certainly a good point. I would not undertake to evaluate it, but merely for the first few months of the initial training of any soldier, it takes in the neighborhood of $2,000 to teach him the rudiments of military training. The marines to whom I have referred are already trained. They are familiar with action of all kinds. They are trained to be artillerymen, infantrymen, and everything else a marine is called on to be. The only excuse I have heard, in or out of committee, for such a reduction is that we are going to have a Marine Reserve, and that Reserve has been building up numerically. It is common sense that after a soldier returns to civilian life for a while, no matter how good a soldier he was, his muscles lose their hardness, and he does not have as quick an eye, and is not so good as a trigger man, as he formerly had. He needs months and months of training, not only for his own welfare, but for the general welfare. I am not willing, for the amount of money involved, even though there would be marines in reserve, to see happen again what happened in World War I and World War II, when men were put into action with only a little training. I am not willing to take a chance of weakening our ground forces. I still believe that initial battles are won by men on the ground. I cannot see any sense in reducing the Marine forces.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. My time has expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much time remains to each side on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has 15 minutes remaining to him. The Senator from California has 58 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, since we have only 15 minutes remaining on this side, and since my friends on the other side have 58 minutes, I wonder if they are willing to proceed at this time.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Maine.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I have the greatest respect for the judgment and knowledge of the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] on the subject of our Air Force. But in having that respect for him, I cannot support his attempt to discredit President Eisenhower as a capable analyst and evaluator of the defense needs of our country.

I do not consider President Eisenhower infallible. None of us are infallible, including the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri and myself.

In his attempt to discredit the defense judgment of President Eisenhower, the man who led us to victory in World War II, the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri has indulged in the luxury of hindsight. I do not begrudge him that luxury. But if he is to see fit to use it, then so may others.

So, in answer to his application of the luxury of hindsight in his attempt to discredit the military judgment of President Eisenhower in that period shortly preceding the Korean war, I would call his attention to the fact that only a few days before the outbreak of the Korean war, the then President of the United States, on whose team the Senator was serving as Secretary of the Air Force, publicly stated that we were nearer peace than we had been since the end of World War II.

As for the subject of the strength of the Air Force, I would call the attention of the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri to the fact that in the pre-Korean war period to which he has referred, the then President of the United States, in defiance of the will of the Congress and the legislation it had passed, deliberately put a 48-group ceiling on the Air Force after Congress had passed legislation providing for a 70-group Air Force.

While I recall that the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri initially took a strong stand for a 70-group Air Force at that time in his capacity as Secretary of the Air Force, I do not recall that he continued to publicly maintain that stand.

To the contrary, it is my impression that after President Truman and Defense Secretary Forrestal took their positions against a 70-group Air Force, the then Secretary of the Air Force chose not to proceed in defiance of his superiors on the Truman team, but rather abruptly terminated his public statements about the 70-group Air Force and accepted the decree of his superiors for a smaller Air Force.

I do not say that the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri was wrong in the revised stand he took. I have no criticism of it. But I recall it to the attention of the Members of this body for the purpose of perspective in this luxury game of hindsight about positions taken shortly prior to the outbreak of the Korean war. If we are to sit in judgment on the positions taken at that time, then let us apply the same standard to all—and also be aware of the position taken by those who now seek to discredit President Eisenhower for the position he took at that time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask the acting minority leader to yield some time to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to yield 1 minute at this time to the junior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield me half a minute?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I promised to yield time to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well. I wanted to speak because it is not Truman or Eisenhower who is involved.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall yield time to the Senator from New Mexico in a moment. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, there is nobody on the floor of the Senate, in either party, for whom I have greater respect than I have for the senior Senator from Maine. I assure her I was not attempting to discredit anybody. I would respectively say that when it became obvious the Air Force was to be composed of only 48 groups, I resigned from the Air Force, and quietly gave that out as the reason for my resignation. I did not think that decision should preclude me from further effort to serve my country.

I should like to say to the distinguished senior Senator from Maine, whether she agrees with me in this case or not, that many people are fallible. Everybody may be fallible. I, therefore, hope that she will give deep consideration to this question because of her vast experience in the field of military strength, including the reserve field, and thereupon vote for the amendment which is now before the Senate. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am extremely sorry the debate has come to this point. President Truman made history. President Eisenhower is making history. The pending bill is not based on who had the advantage when Truman was President

or whether President Eisenhower should have the advantage now. This bill is in the interest of the defense and the national security of the people of the United States, and I should like to have the bill remain that way.

The bill was unanimously reported by the full committee, without any consideration whatsoever as to which political party would have any advantage or would not have any advantage. I hope the Senate will consider the bill as one for the American people as a whole.

The cost of the bill will have to be paid by the American people, and the cost is not small. Let us try to keep the bill one for the entire Nation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President——

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield 30 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the question of the proposed manpower increase in the Marine Corps and the Army.

It is my understanding that the Senator from Missouri does not intend to submit an amendment regarding the Air Force, although he has discussed that subject.

I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], whether he intends to place in the RECORD, before the debate is concluded, the letter from Secretary Talbott, regarding the Air Force.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes, Mr. President, it is my purpose to place the letter in the RECORD, inasmuch as I think the letter covers present needs and present desires of the Air Force, and in my opinion Secretary Talbott honestly sent the letter to the chairman of the subcommittee. So it is my purpose to have the Senate, the House of Representatives, and all the American people have knowledge of the letter.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, today we stand in a crosscurrent of world affairs. On the one hand, we find a growing hope on the part of some persons, deliberately encouraged by the Communists, that we are entering into an era of mutual understanding and enduring peace. On the other hand, we find growing apprehension on the part of other persons, again deliberately encouraged by the Communists, that the United States is falling behind in the race for military-technological supremacy.

At this time, hardheaded realism and calm perspective are needed. We should not permit ourselves to be taken in by mere Communist protestations of peace, and thus prematurely lower our guard. Neither should we permit ourselves to be panicked into hasty and ill-considered changes in our carefully planned and thoroughly considered military programs.

Mr. President, we must face the fact that defense expenditures in the vicinity of $34 billion a year—and perhaps more—will burden our national budget for years to come. This being so, we cannot deal solely on a year-by-year basis with the defense program if it is to be effective.

We must also face the fact that each of our military services is merely a part of our total military force. The appropriate size and structure of any one of the military services can be intelligently determined only in relation to the size and structure of the other military services and our defense problem as a whole.

In determining the overall size and composition of the military force required for our security in the years to come, we dare not overlook the fact that changes in the international situation and changes in the technology of warfare inevitably necessitate changes in our military strategy and in the proportioning of our total military force, in order to achieve the optimum balance among the various components of that force. In this regard, we must always keep in mind that there is no such thing as absolute security. National defense will always be a calculated risk, no matter how many billions of dollars we spend or how many millions of men we keep in uniform.

In achieving the proper balance in our military effort, the value of an additional man in the Army or Marine Corps must be equated with the value of an additional man in the Navy or the Air Force, and, for that matter, in the Reserve components. The benefits to be derived from additional expenditures for more manpower must be measured against the value of additional expenditures for more aircraft, more guided missiles, more research and development, more air bases, and so forth. The cost of more national defense must be weighed against the additional burden placed on the taxpayer and the effect on his incentive as a worker and a producer in our economic system. All these things must be weighed in the balance, in determining the size of any one of our military services.

This, I believe, is what President Eisenhower meant when he said, in his letter to Secretary of Defense Wilson:

> It is at this point that professional military competence and political statesmanship must join to form judgments as to the minimum defensive structure that should be supported by the Nation. To do less than the minimum would expose the Nation to the predatory purposes of potential enemies. On the other hand, to build excessively under the impulse of fear could, in the long run, defeat our purposes by damaging the growth of our economy and eventually forcing it into regimented controls.

Mr. President, who is in better position than President Eisenhower to make such judgment? Not only as President and Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, but also as a man who has spent the greater part of his mature life in the military service of his country, and as a man who both in peace and in war has commanded great coalitions of military forces of many nations, he has acquired the background, the experience, and the facts upon which to base such judgments. No one can deny that.

In his letter to the Secretary of Defense, which appears on page 3 of the Senate Appropriations Committee hearings on the Department of Defense appropriations for fiscal year 1956, the President clearly states the concepts underlying his decisions on the military forces and programs proposed for the coming fiscal year. Briefly, they are as follows:

First. That the security of the United States is inextricably bound up with the security of the free world, and that growing reliance can be placed upon the forces now being built and strengthened with our help in many areas of the free world.

Second. That the threat to our security is a continuing and many-sided one; and that, so far as can be determined, there is no single critical "danger date," and no single form of enemy action to which we could soundly gear all our defense preparations.

Third. That true security for our country must be based on a strong and expanding economy, readily convertible to the tasks of war.

Fourth. That we should base our security upon military formations which make maximum use of science and technology, in order to minimize numbers of men.

Fifth. That our first objective must be to maintain the capability to deter an enemy from an attack, and to blunt that attack if it comes, by a combination of effective retaliatory power and a continental air-defense system of steadily increasing effectiveness.

Sixth. That we must also have forces to clear the ocean lanes and to meet critical land situations.

Seventh. That both in composition and in strength, our security arrangements must have long-term applicability.

Eighth. That in view of the practical considerations limiting the rapid development of major military forces from the continental United States immediately upon the outbreak of war, the numbers of active troops maintained for this purpose can be correspondingly tailored. For the remainder, we may look primarily to our Reserves.

Who in this Chamber will quarrel with these concepts? The military forces and programs recommended by the President in his fiscal year 1956 budget faithfully adhere to these concepts, and only in that context can we properly appraise the adequacy of the forces and military strengths proposed by the President.

Specifically, the President's budget for the coming fiscal year provides a total military personnel strength of 2,859,000 for June 30 of next year—or a net reduction of 102,000, or less than 3½ percent, from the estimated strength of 2,961,000 for June 30 of this year. During the coming fiscal year, the Air Force will increase in strength by 5,000—from 970,000 to 975,000; the Navy will reduce by 8,000—from 672,000 to 664,000, including officer candidates; the Marine Corps will reduce by 12,000—from 205,000 to 193,000; and the Army will reduce by 87,000—from 1,114,000 to 1,027,000, including West Point cadets.

There has been no controversy concerning the military personnel strength proposed for the Air Force for fiscal year 1956. The continued build-up of the Air Force clearly justifies the increase. There has been little discussion of the Navy but there has, however, been a good deal of controversy concerning the Army and Marine Corps reductions.

First, I would like to discuss the reduction in Marine Corps military personnel strength proposed in the President's fiscal year 1956 budget and reflected in the bill now before the Senate. This reduction amounts to 12,000, or 6 percent of the estimated June 30, 1955, strength. It is made possible in large part by lower personnel turnover expected in the coming fiscal year, a reduction in the personnel pipeline which will result from the return of a Marine division from Japan, and the elimination of marginal or less essential units or activities.

The Marine Corps, with an end strength of 193,000 men, will continue to support 3 divisions and 3 air wings at a high level of combat readiness. These forces, General Shepherd, Commandant of the Marine Corps, told us, "are ready to go into combat now, and will remain so during the coming fiscal year." The reduction in military personnel will not affect the readiness of the basic striking forces.

In this connection, it should be noted that in June 1950, the Marine Corps supported 2 divisions and 2 air wings with about 74,000 men. In fiscal year 1956, the Marine Corps will have a force just half again as large, but will have more than 2½ times the number of men it had in June 1950. Obviously, with even a reasonably good utilization of its manpower, the Marine Corps in fiscal year 1956 will be a vastly better manned and combat-ready force than it was in 1950.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will yield if the distinguished acting minority leader [Mr. GOLDWATER] will give me a little more time. I have not sufficient time to complete my prepared remarks.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The majority leader has time of his own at his disposal, if he cares to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would appreciate the opportunity of concluding my statement. Then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, if the acting minority leader will yield time to the Senator? I should like to quote directly from General Shepherd's own statement at the committee hearing.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate the Senator's cooperation, but I declined to yield to my friends on the other side of the aisle, and, under the circumstances, I think it is only fair not to yield to him.

Mr. THYE. I respect the decision of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank my friend.

There has been some confusion in the current discussions of the Marine Corps manning problem. It has been asserted, for example, that the 193,000 end strength provided in the President's fiscal year 1956 budget will enable the Marine Corps to man its units at only about 80 percent of full strength. Yet, General Shepherd says that the basic striking forces of the Marine Corps "are ready to go into combat now, and will remain so during the coming fiscal year."

What has not been brought out clearly in the debate on Marine Corps manning is the fact that the three Marine divisions, a major part of the force, will be manned during fiscal year 1956 at 100 percent of war strength, a higher level of manning than that achieved a year ago, when the Marine Corps had a total strength of about 224,000 men.

The other major element of the Marine Corps, the three air wings, will be manned at better than 80 percent of full war strength, a level of manning which compares very favorably with similar units in the Navy air arm and in the Air Force.

The reason why units of this type can be manned at less than war strength when not actually engaged in combat is that their peacetime operation does not require the full complement of men in such categories as ammunition loaders, medical detachments, aircraft repair, and so forth.

The manning levels planned for the fiscal year 1956 will, however, permit these air units, in the event of a war emergency, to operate at full combat rates for an initial period of time within which reinforcements can be provided. This also applies to those supporting type units of the Marine Corps which will be manned below full war strength.

There is absolutely no basis for the contention that the cut of 12,000 men will impair the ability of the Marine Corps to do its job. General Shepherd has stated categorically "we can do the job." The only adverse effect of this cut, he said, will be to diminish "somewhat the staying power of our combat forces." But at the same time he pointed out, "In any major emergency the Marine Corps relies heavily on its reserve component." This reserve, by end of fiscal year 1956, will number 51,000 men, or 19,000 more than in December 1954, and, in the words of the Commandant of the Marine Corps, "stands ready to be called in as they were in the case of Korea, in a period of a month or 6 weeks."

This is possible because the Marine Corps reserves will be integrated into the active forces as individuals and not as units.

On the basis of all the evidence, it would appear that the Marine Corps, as usual, has the situation well in hand.

The largest manpower cut proposed in the President's fiscal year 1956 budget, both numerically and proportionately, falls on the Army. During the coming fiscal year the active duty strength of the Army will be reduced by about 87,000 men. However, and this is very important, only 22,000 of this reduction will come from the combat units—a cut of only 4 percent. The balance of 65,000 will come from "overhead"—service units, support forces, training, and pipeline.

Admittedly, "overhead" troops are necessary, but they are not the men who do the fighting. Reductions in this area, to the extent they do not impair the effectiveness of the combat forces, should be enthusiastically encouraged by the Senate.

The large proportion of our total military strength in "overhead" categories has long been a matter of major concern to this body. About 3 years ago, a Senate committee, under the chairmanship of the present distinguished majority leader, made a thorough study of this very problem. The committee found a high degree of waste in the utilization of manpower by the Armed Forces.

Since that time, it is fair to say, the services have made excellent progress in improving the utilization of their military manpower. The Army ranks high in this regard and the measure of its progress can be found in the dramatic reduction in the ratio of noncombat to combat personnel. At the end of fiscal year 1953, the Army had about 2 noncombat personnel for each man in the combat units—966,000 noncombat personnel versus 567,000 in combat units. By the end of fiscal year 1956, this ratio will be about 1-for-1—525,000 noncombat personnel versus 502,000 in combat units. To put it another way, the Army from June 30, 1953, to June 30, 1956, will decline in total numbers by 506,000, but 411,000, or fully 87 percent of the total reduction, will be in the noncombat category.

To an important degree, the end of combat operations in Korea contributed to this reduction, particularly in training and pipeline. However, the full extent of this reduction could not have been achieved without major improvements in the organization, management, and utilization of military personnel, and for this the Army is entitled to full credit. Here are some specific examples of such improvements:

First. The Army is conducting a continuing review of tables of organization and distribution to eliminate unnecessary or marginal positions. Such reviews during the 6-month period July–December 1954, for example, have enabled the Army to eliminate over 30,000 military positions, principally in the support area.

Second. The Army is substituting civilian personnel in place of military personnel wherever economical and not detrimental to combat effectiveness or the requirement for the rotation of military personnel between overseas and continental United States assignments. In one current project, Operation Teammate, for example, the Army is replacing 12,000 military personnel in its supporting forces with civilians.

Third. Wherever possible, the Army is continuing the use of foreign nationals in place of United States military personnel overseas.

Fourth. Since June 30, 1953, the Army has extensively reorganized its training establishment, consolidating and reducing the number of separate schools, con-

solidating and shortening many courses, reducing student waiting time prior to commencement of classes, and eliminating excessive travel time to and from schools.

Fifth. Only last year the Army devised and put into effect a new rotation program called Gyroscope. Under this program men will rotate overseas with their units and will stay with these units until they complete their terms of service, or, if they are career personnel, until the unit returns home. This will greatly reduce the number of individual moves and the in-transit pipeline as well as provide the stability of assignment so necessary as a career incentive. Under the same program 3 combat divisions will engage in individual training during their tour of duty in continental United States, and will receive their new men directly from induction stations, thus reducing the number of moves and time in travel status.

Sixth. In 1954 alone the Army conducted 766 manpower-utilization surveys of units and organization in the United States and overseas. These surveys not only resulted in the reduction of military spaces, but in civilian personnel as well.

While the number of men on full-time duty with the Army will decline by 87,000 in the fiscal year 1956, the number on drill-pay status in the Army Reserve forces will increase by 90,000, to a total of 644,000. This increase in Ready Reserve forces is not dependent on the new Reserve legislation now before the Congress.

I do not wish to imply that this increase of 90,000 in Ready Reserve forces is a man-for-man substitute for the reduction of 87,000 in the Army's active duty strength. Nevertheless, the increase in Ready Reserve forces adds materially to the overall strength of the Army.

In all fairness to the men who devote their time and effort to the Reserve programs, we must recognize the contribution they make to our national defense. Our Reserve forces are not all they could and should be, but neither are they completely devoid of combat effectiveness. Even today, the Ready Reserve forces of the Army represent a significant part of our overall military strength, and the addition of 90,000 to their number is a measurable increase in that strength.

Although the reduction in military personnel in the combat units of the Regular Army amounts to only about 4 percent, some realinement of forces will nevertheless be required. The Army will have 18 divisions at the end of the coming fiscal year, compared with 20 at the present time, but the number of antiaircraft battalions will be significantly larger. These divisions will be well manned during fiscal year 1956. All combat divisions deployed in Europe and the Far East will continue to be manned at 100 percent of wartime strength and ready for combat.

Furthermore, certain other combat divisions located in the United States, which would be required for deployment overseas in the early months of an all-out war, will also be manned at 100 percent of wartime strength and maintained at a high level of combat readiness. Most of the remaining combat divisions of the Army in the United States will be manned at full strength, but because they will be heavily engaged in training activities, their combat readiness will vary from time to time.

A few Army divisions will not be manned at full strength, but General Ridgway, Chief of Staff of the Army, has stated that, "back in the continental United States there can be a certain percentage accepted as a reasonable risk below full strength in some units."

It has been proposed that the military personnel strength of the Army be continued through the coming fiscal year at the estimated June 30, 1955, level of 1,114,000. The justification for this change is that it will permit the Army to maintain the present 20 divisions instead of reducing to 18. Why specifically 1,114,000 men and 20 divisions? The answer is quite obvious. It is the number of men and divisions we are supposed to have by the end of this month.

Many people have apparently forgotten that the Army at the close of the Korean war had no more than 20 divisions, 6 of which were committed to the Korean battlefront. Hostilities in Korea ended 2 years ago. It certainly does not seem reasonable to me to insist that the Army, now, must have the same number of divisions it had when this Nation was engaged in a large-scale shooting war in Korea. The reduction of 2 divisions contemplated in the fiscal year 1956 budget does not appear to me to be out of line with the reduction in the Army's task represented by the end of hostilities in Korea.

It has been argued that the retention of the 20 divisions should encourage our allies by indicating that the United States intends to remain strong and active in their support. The President's program full recognizes that the security of the United States is inextricably bound up with the security of the free world. But the President's program also recognizes that the defense of the free world is a collective undertaking and that each of the nations participating in this collective defense should contribute those forces which they can best contribute in view of their particular capabilities.

The United States has made a special effort in recent years to develop forces which would best complement the military contributions of our allies. For example, the United States is placing major emphasis on airpower, particularly retaliatory airpower, because only the United States and, to a lesser extent, the United Kingdom are in a position to provide this type of extremely complex and costly military forces.

The fiscal year 1956 budget proposed by the President provides for a continued buildup of the strategic airpower of the Air Force and the striking power of the naval air arm. These forces are not only being strengthened in numbers but in quality as well. In the Air Force, the medium bomber units have now all been converted to jet and conversion of the heavy bomber units to jet aircraft will soon start. In the Navy, the new Forrestal-type carriers will soon begin to join the fleets and the modernization of the older-type attack carriers is nearing completion. All carriers are being equipped with newer and improved aircraft, while at the same time the potentialities of the seaplane are being actively explored.

For our own protection we must also provide for a steady buildup in our air defense forces. The fiscal year 1956 budget reflects an increase in the continental defense forces of all three services.

While most of our allies have little or no capability for the provision of the more complex air and naval forces, they do have the capability, with our help, of providing suitable ground forces and some tactical air and local naval forces.

Since 1949 the Congress has made available for military assistance to our allies a total of $19 billion, of which about $11 billion has actually been delivered. This aid has produced good results.

In Europe, where in the summer of 1950 the members of the Atlantic Alliance had only about 14 divisions and less than 1,000 aircraft, the NATO forces have been increased several-fold. More importantly, the combat power of these forces has been increased in far greater proportion than in numbers. The present forces are much superior in equipping, training, and facilities and are much better organized and deployed for the common defense of Europe.

The NATO forces now in being constitute a very effective defensive shield which could be penetrated only by an all-out effort on the part of an aggressor. This, in itself, is an effective insurance against a so-called accidental or unpremeditated war, which is one of the grave dangers the world faces.

The combat power of the NATO forces will continue to grow as military assistance now programed is delivered and as the recipient nations improve their own defense production capability and the organization and training of their military forces. In 2 or 3 years the German contribution should begin to be effective, further improving the combat power of the NATO forces.

In the Far East, significant forces—almost all ground—have been developed, particularly in Korea and Formosa, and to a lesser extent in Japan, the Philippines, and the free nations of southeast Asia. In 1950 these nations had little or no military forces of any consequence. With our help these forces will continue to grow in numbers and in quality. Substantial United States military assistance is presently programed for the free nations in that area of the world.

The United States is also helping certain nations in the Middle East to develop their military forces. Except for Turkey, this effort is just beginning, but results are already apparent.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a table showing the allocation of military personnel which clearly illustrates the points I have made. First I ask unanimous consent to have printed the table relating to the Army.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Allocation of military personnel by functional category, actual June 30, 1953, and projected June 30, 1955, and June 30, 1956

[In thousands]

ARMY

Category	June 30, 1953		June 30, 1955		June 30, 1956	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Operating forces	797	52	750	67	702	68
Supporting forces	237	15	167	15	159	15
Training base	381	25	149	13	125	12
Transients, etc	119	8	49	4	41	4
Total [1]	1,534	100	[2] 1,114	100	1,027	100

[1] Totals may not add due to rounding.

[2] The figure shown in the fiscal year 1956 budget was 1,102,000. Army, end fiscal year 1955, strength was subsequently increased by 12,000. For purposes of this table, the same percentage distribution by category has been assumed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I discussed a similar table relating to the Marine Corps. The table which has just been put into the RECORD relates to the Army. If the President's program is adopted, the Army operating forces will be increased from 67 percent to 68 percent, an increase of 1 percent, even with the contemplated reduction. The supporting forces will remain the same, at 15 percent. The training base will be reduced 1 percent, from 13 percent to 12 percent. The transients, and others, will remain the same, at 4 percent. Therefore the net result, if the program is adopted, will be to increase the operating forces by 1 percent, and to decrease the training base by 1 percent. Otherwise the situation remains exactly the same.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the tables with reference to the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Allocation of millitary personnel by functional category, actual June 30, 1953, and projected June 30, 1955, and June 30, 1956

[In thousands]

NAVY

Category	June 30, 1953		June 30, 1955		June 30, 1956	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Operating forces	504	63	400	60	390	59
Supporting forces	143	18	123	18	120	18
Training base	109	14	108	16	112	17
Transients, etc	39	5	42	6	42	6
Total [1]	794	100	672	100	664	100

MARINE CORPS

Category	June 30, 1953		June 30, 1955		June 30, 1956	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Operating forces	148	59	134	65	119	62
Supporting forces	31	12	22	11	21	11
Training base	41	16	31	15	36	19
Transients, etc	30	12	18	9	17	9
Total [1]	249	100	205	100	193	100

AIR FORCE

Operating forces	486	50	553	57	588	60
Supporting forces	196	20	148	15	139	14
Training base	257	26	242	25	230	24
Transients, etc	38	4	28	3	18	2
Total [1]	978	100	970	100	975	100

[1] Totals may not add due to rounding.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it can be seen from these tables that the proportion of military personnel in the operating forces of the Army will increase from 52 percent on June 30, 1953, to 68 percent by June 30, 1956. The percentage of military personnel in the operating forces of the Navy will decline somewhat because of the heavy training load the Navy anticipates in the coming fiscal year. In the Marine Corps, the percentage of military personnel in the operating forces will increase from 59 percent on June 30, 1953, to 62 percent by June 30, 1956. In the Air Force, the percentage of military personnel in the operating forces will increase during the same period from 50 to 60 percent.

Mr. President, I remind the Senate that to maintain the higher strengths proposed for the Army, we shall have to draft twice the number of young men presently planned for fiscal year 1956. The Congress has the power and, indeed, the duty to demand from our young men a contribution of their time and effort in the military service of their country. But do we have the duty, do we have the moral right to tear these young men away from their homes and families, to disrupt their studies or civilian careers when the need for their services in our military forces has not been indisputably established?

The President of the United States, Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces and former Chief of Staff of the Army, told Congress in his budget message, without any equivocation whatsoever, that in his judgment the forces provided in that budget "are accurately adjusted to the national needs." If ever there were a man uniquely qualified to form such a judgment, he is that man. Himself a product of the Army, deeply attached to its ways and traditions, but now in a position to view our problem of national defense in its full perspective, President Eisenhower has recommended to the Congress and to the people of this country an Army of 1,027,000 men for June 30, 1956.

Mr. President, I shall vote in support of President Eisenhower's Army program, and the entire military program of which it is a constituent part. In the best interests of our Nation, I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course all of us wish to cooperate with the President, but, as I recall the testimony of General Ridgway, is it not a fact that he testified before the committee that he believed the President's budget report and the testimony given by Secretary Wilson were entirely different? General Ridgway testified that he did not agree with that testimony.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct, as always. I would say that General Ridgway, of course, was asking for more men in the Army. I, too, would take his position if I were in the Army and were nervous as to what might be expected of me. General Ridgway, however, testified that the men in our Army might be used in areas of the world where I, for one, would never vote to send them, namely, to such places as Quemoy and the Matsus, and so forth.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The only point I wish to have clearly made in the RECORD is that so far as our Defense Department is concerned, the military men did not agree with the budget requests, whereas the civilian officials of the Defense Department agreed with the budget requests. That is the only point I wish to make.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Admiral Radford, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs

of Staff, General Twining, and Admiral Carney, agreed with the President's budget. General Ridgway very frankly testified that he would like to have more men in the Army.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that while it is true that General Twining did agree, he did so very reluctantly, and he thought he needed more money than Secretary Talbott had requested?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to my friend that every department wants more money than the Bureau of the Budget allows. The President must take all the requests together and do what he thinks is best.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do want to keep the RECORD straight. The testimony before the committee——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, what is the time situation on this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has 14 minutes, and the Senator from California has 23 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield three minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield for a question.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Massachusetts has yielded for a question. I should like to make a brief comment, and then ask a question.

Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who is the ranking Republican member on the Armed Services Committee, and, therefore, has not only considered in that committee the question of military strength and manpower, but he has also been a member of the Appropriations Committee, so that he has studied the question from an appropriations standpoint. I commend him for making a clear statement on the manpower question, not only as it relates to the Marines, but as it relates to the other Armed Forces.

I should like to read a portion of the testimony of General Shepherd, appearing on page 136 of the hearings, wherein, in answer to a question, he made the following statement:

General SHEPHERD. During the next 2 years our plans call for the involuntary release of 179 officers in fiscal year 1956, and 151 officers in fiscal year 1957. To retain these officers on active duty we would require an additional estimated amount of $1,245,000 for fiscal year 1956, and approximately $807,000 for fiscal year 1957. Enlisted marines present a different picture. During the next 2 years the Marine Corps does not plan to separate involuntarily any qualified enlisted marines. The reenlistment program instituted by the Marine Corps is designed to insure that every enlisted marine who meets the standards of a career marine is encouraged to remain in the service.

Senator ROBERTSON. How much for just noncommissioned officers?

General SHEPHERD. Noncommissioned officers are included in my preceding statement concerning retention of enlisted personnel. All qualified noncommissioned officers are being encouraged to remain in the Marine Corps.

On page 115 General Shepherd stated specifically that the Reserve program was an advance over what the Department had anticipated, and what ultimately developed. He said:

This submission will support the growth of the drill pay Reserve from about 63 percent to 80 percent of the personnel goal by the end of fiscal year 1956.

So, Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts was giving us a factual report not only as a member of the Armed Services Committee, but as one of the senior members of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 67) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, with an amendment; that the House insisted upon its amendment, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MURRAY, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, and Mr. REES of Kansas were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAY BILL, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives on the Federal classified pay bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 67) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 603 (b) and section 603 (c) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (65 Stat. 612; 5 U. S. C., sec. 1113 (b) and (c)), are amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates									
GS-1	$2,690	$2,775	$2,860	$2,945	$3,030	$3,115	$3,200			
GS-2	2,955	3,040	3,125	3,210	3,295	3,380	3,465			
GS-3	3,170	3,255	3,340	3,425	3,510	3,595	3,680			
GS-4	3,415	3,500	3,585	3,670	3,755	3,840	3,925			
GS-5	3,665	3,800	3,935	4,070	4,205	4,340	4,475			
GS-6	4,080	4,215	4,350	4,485	4,620	4,755	4,890			
GS-7	4,520	4,655	4,790	4,925	5,060	5,195	5,330			
GS-8	4,965	5,100	5,235	5,370	5,505	5,640	5,775			
GS-9	5,440	5,575	5,710	5,845	5,980	6,115	6,250			
GS-10	5,915	6,050	6,185	6,320	6,455	6,590	6,725			
GS-11	6,385	6,600	6,815	7,030	7,245	7,460				
GS-12	7,570	7,785	8,000	8,215	8,430	8,645				
GS-13	8,985	9,200	9,415	9,630	9,845	10,060				
GS-14	10,320	10,535	10,750	10,965	11,180	11,395				
GS-15	11,610	11,880	12,150	12,420	12,690					
GS-16	12,900	13,115	13,330	13,545	13,760					
GS-17	13,975	14,190	14,405	14,620						
GS-18	14,800									

"(c) (1) The compensation schedule for the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates									
CPC-1	$1,945	$2,010	$2,075	$2,140	$2,205	$2,270	$2,335			
CPC-2	2,600	2,675	2,750	2,825	2,900	2,975	3,050			
CPC-3	2,745	2,830	2,915	3,000	3,085	3,170	3,255			
CPC-4	2,955	3,040	3,125	3,210	3,295	3,380	3,465			
CPC-5	3,200	3,285	3,370	3,455	3,540	3,625	3,710			
CPC-6	3,440	3,525	3,610	3,695	3,780	3,865	3,950			
CPC-7	3,695	3,805	3,915	4,025	4,135	4,245	4,355			
CPC-8	4,020	4,155	4,290	4,425	4,560	4,695	4,830			
CPC-9	4,460	4,595	4,730	4,865	5,000	5,135	5,270			
CPC-10	4,905	5,040	5,175	5,310	5,445	5,580	5,715			

"(2) Charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of $2,900 per annum, and head charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of $3,050 per annum."

(b) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom this section applies shall be initially adjusted as follows:

(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the scheduled or longevity rates of a grade in the General Schedule or the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled or longevity rate in effect on and after such date;

(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between two scheduled or two longevity rates, or between a scheduled and a longevity rate, of a grade in the General Schedule or the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date;

(3) If the officer or employee (other than an officer or employee subject to paragraph (4) of this subsection), immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving basic compensation at a rate in excess of the maximum longevity rate of his grade, or in excess of the maximum scheduled rate of his grade if there is no longevity rate for his grade, he shall receive basic compensation at a rate equal to the rate which he received immediately prior to such effective date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this section in the maximum longevity rate, or the maximum scheduled rate, as the case may be, of his grade until (A) he leaves such position, or (B) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; but when such position becomes vacant the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with such act, as amended; or

(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving an existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under section 208 (b) of the act of September 1, 1954 (Public Law 763, 83d Cong.), he shall receive an aggregate rate of compensation equal to such existing aggregate rate, increased by an

amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this section in the maximum longevity rate of his grade until he (A) leaves such position, or (B) is entitled to receive aggregate compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of any other provision of law; but when such position becomes vacant the aggregate rate of compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with applicable provisions of law. For the purposes of section 208 (b) of the act of September 1, 1954 (Public Law 763, 83d Cong.), the amount of such increase shall be held and considered to constitute a part of the existing aggregate rate of compensation of such employee; or

(5) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this action, was in a position for which the rate of compensation is fixed under section 603 (c) (2) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and at such time he was receiving basic compensation at a rate in excess of the rate provided for his position under such section, he shall receive basic compensation at a rate equal to the rate he was paid immediately prior to such effective date increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this section in the rate for like positions under such section 603 (c) (2) until he leaves such position; but when such position becomes vacant the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with such section.

(c) Each officer or employee—

(1) (A) who with his position has been transferred, at any time during the period beginning January 1, 1952, and ending on the date of enactment of this act, from the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule or the General Schedule to a prevailing rate schedule pursuant to the Classification Act of 1949 or title I of the act of September 1, 1954 (Public Law 763, 83d Cong.), or (B) who, at any time during the period beginning on the effective date of this section and ending on the date of enactment of this act, transferred from a position subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to a position subject to a prevailing rate schedule;

(2) who at all times subsequent to such transfer was in the service of the United States (including the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, without break in such service of more than 30 consecutive calendar days and, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, without break in service in excess of the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia;

(3) who is on such date of enactment being compensated under a prevailing rate schedule; and

(4) whose rate of basic compensation is less on such date of enactment than the rate to which he would have been entitled on such date of enactment if such transfer had not occurred (unless he is receiving such lesser rate by reason of an adverse personnel action resulting from his own fault),

shall be paid basic compensation at a rate equal to the rate which he would have been receiving on such date of enactment (including compensation for each within-grade and longevity step-increase which he would have earned) if such transfer had not occurred until the day immediately following such date of enactment, for all time in a pay status on and after the effective date of this section in a position subject to a prevailing rate schedule under the circumstances prescribed in this subsection, until (A) he leaves the position which he holds on such date of enactment, or (B) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate under a prevailing rate schedule; but when such position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with prevailing rate schedules.

(d) The rate of basic compensation of each officer or employee who, at any time during the period beginning on the effective date of this section and ending on the date of enactment of this act, became subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, at a rate of basic compensation which was fixed on the basis of a higher previously earned rate or which was established under authority of section 803 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (68 Stat. 1106; 5 U. S. C., sec. 1133), and which is above the minimum rate of the grade of such officer or employee, shall be adjusted, retroactively to the date on which he became subject to such act, on the basis of the rate for that step of the appropriate grade of the appropriate compensation schedule contained in this section which corresponds numerically to the step of the grade of the compensation schedule for such officer or employee which was in effect (without regard to this act) at the time he became subject to the Classification Act of 1949 as in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section.

(e) The last sentence of section 704 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "Notwithstanding subsection (b) (4) of section 703, longevity step-increases for grade 15 of the General Schedule shall be the same as those for grade 14 of the General Schedule."

SEC. 3. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision a of section 62 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C., sec. 102 (a) (2)), section 3656 of title 18 of the United States Code, the second and third sentences of section 603, section 604 (a) (5), or sections 672 to 675, inclusive, of title 28 of the United States Code are hereby increased by amounts equal to the increases provided by section 2 of this act in corresponding rates of compensation paid to officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The limitations of $10,560 and $14,355 with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges, contained in the paragraph under the heading "Salaries of Supporting Personnel" in the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1955 (Public Law 470, 83d Cong.), or in any subsequent appropriation act, shall be increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this act.

(c) Section 753 (e) of title 28 of the United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts) is amended by striking out "$6,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$6,450."

SEC. 4 (a) Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 7.5 percent of the aggregate rate of his rate of basic compensation and the rate of the additional compensation received by him under sections 501 and 502 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, section 301 of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, the provisions under the heading "Increased pay for legislative employees" in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, the act of October 24, 1951 (Public Law 201, 82d Cong.), and any other provision of law.

(b) Section 2 (b) of the act of October 24, 1951 (Public Law 201, 82d Cong.), is amended by striking out "$11,646 per annum unless expressly authorized by law" and inserting in lieu thereof "the highest per annum rate of compensation paid under authority of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, unless expressly authorized by law."

(c) The rates of basic compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives (not including the presiding officers of the two Houses), the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, the Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives, and the Coordinator of Information of the House of Representatives are hereby increased by 7.5 pecent.

(d) The limitations in the paragraph designated "Folding documents" under the heading "Contingent Expenses of the House" in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1955 (Public Law 470, 83d Cong.), are hereby increased by 7.5 percent.

SEC. 5. Section 66 of the Farm Credit Act of 1938 (48 Stat. 269) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 66. No director, officer, or employee of the Central Bank for Cooperatives or of any production credit corporation, production credit association, or bank for cooperatives shall be paid compensation at a rate in excess of $14,620 per annum."

SEC. 6. (a) Each of the minimum rates of salary contained in section 3 (d), the maximum rate of salary contained in the second sentence of such section 3 (d), and each of the maximum and minimum rates of salary contained in section 7, of the act of January 3, 1946 (Public Law 293, 79th Cong.), as amended (38 U. S. C., secs. 15b (d) and 15f (a)), are hereby increased by 7.5 percent.

(b) Each of the rates of salary contained in section 3 (e) and section 3 (f) of such act of January 3, 1946, as amended (38 U. S. C., secs. 15b (e) and (f)), is hereby increased by 7.5 percent.

(c) Each of the rates of salary increased by subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be rounded, as so increased, to the nearest $5 per annum, counting $2.50 per annum and over as $5 per annum.

(d) Section 8 (d) of such act of January 3, 1946, as amended (38 U. S. C., sec. 15g (d)), is amended by striking out "$12,800" and inserting in lieu thereof "$13,760."

SEC. 7. Each of the rates of basic compensation provided by sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is hereby increased by 7.5 percent. Each such rate as so increased shall be rounded to the nearest $5 per annum, counting $2.50 per annum and over as $5 per annum.

SEC. 8. (a) Notwithstanding section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C., sec. 665), the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the municipal government of the District of Columbia whose rates of compensation are fixed by administrative action pursuant to law and are not otherwise increased by this act are hereby authorized to be increased, effective on or after the first day of the first pay period which began after February 28, 1955, by amounts not to exceed the increases provided by this act for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

(b) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to authorize any increase in the

rates of compensation of officers and employees whose rates of compensation are fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates or practices.

(c) Nothing contained in this section shall affect the authority contained in any law pursuant to which rates of compensation may be fixed by administrative action.

SEC. 9. Nothwithstanding any other provision of this act, (1) no rate of compensation or salary which is $14,800 or more per annum shall be increased by reason of this act and (2) no rate of compensation or salary shall be increased by reason of this act to an amount in excess of $14,800 per annum.

SEC. 10. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to an officer or employee who retired during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began after February 28, 1955, and ending on the date of enactment of this act for services rendered during such period and (2) in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 636, 81st Cong.), as amended, for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began after February 28, 1955, and ending on the date of enactment of this act by an officer or employee who dies during such period.

(b) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 11. Notwithstanding any provision of this act or of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, no individual subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, whose rate of basic salary is increased by reason of section 701 of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, shall be entitled to receive payment of any increase under the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended by this act, for any period for which he is entitled to receive an increase in basic salary under section 701 of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955.

SEC. 12. (a) Section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (68 Stat. 1105; 5 U. S. C., sec. 1105), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 505. (a) No position shall be placed in grade 16, 17, or 18 of the General Schedule except by action of, or after prior approval by, a majority of the Civil Service Commissioners.

"(b) Subject to subsections (c), (d), and (e) of this section, a majority of the Civil Service Commissioners are authorized to establish and, from time to time, revise the maximum number of positions (not to exceed 1,200) which may be in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule at any one time, except that under such authority such maximum number of positions shall not exceed 325 for grade 17 and 125 for grade 18. The United States Civil Service Commission shall report annually to the Congress the total number of positions established under this subsection for grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule and the total number of positions so established for each such grade.

"(c) The number of positions of senior specialist in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress allocated to grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule by reason of the proviso contained in sec. 203 (b) (1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 836; 2 U. S. C., sec. 166 (b) (1)) shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grades by subsection (b).

"(d) The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized, subject to the procedures prescribed by this section, to place a total of 25 positions in the General Accounting Office in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grades by subsection (b).

"(e) The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, is authorized, without regard to any other provision in this section, to place a total of 37 positions in the Federal Bureau of Investigation in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grades by subsection (b)."

(b) Positions in grades 16, 17, or 18, as the case may be, of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall remain, on and after such effective date, in their respective grades, until other action is taken under the provisions of sec. 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 as in effect on and after such effective date.

(c) The following parts of laws and parts of reorganization plans are hereby repealed:

(1) Section 710 (a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 819; 50 App. U. S. C., sec. 2160 (a));

(2) That part of section 401 (a) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 1254; 50 App. U. S. C., sec 2253 (a)) which reads as follows: "and subject to the standards and procedures of that act, to place not more than 22 positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule established by that act, and any such positions shall be additional to the number authorized by section 505 of that act;";

(3) Section 108 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (64 Stat. 1064; Public Law 843, 81st Cong.);

(4) The fourth paragraph under the heading "General Accounting Office" contained in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952 (65 Stat. 274; Public Law 137, 82d Cong.), as amended by the fourth paragraph under the heading "General Accounting Office" contained in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953 (66 Stat. 399; Public Law 455, 82d Cong.), and by the proviso under the heading "General Accounting Office" contained in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 280; Public Law 428, 83d Cong.; 31 U. S. C., sec. 52a), which reads as follows: "The Comptroller General of the United States hereafter is authorized, subject to the procedures prescribed by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, but without regard to the numerical limitations contained therein, to place 5 positions in grade GS–18, 2 positions in grade GS–17, and 12 positions in grade GS–16 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, and such positions shall be in lieu of any positions in the General Accounting Office previously allocated under section 505. The authority granted herein shall not be construed to require or preclude the reallocation of any positions in the General Accounting Office previously allocated under section 505.";

(5) That part of the paragraph under the heading "Renegotiation Board" and under the subheading "Salaries and Expenses" contained in chapter V of the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952 (65 Stat. 763; Public Law 254, 82d Cong.; 50 App. U. S. C. sec. 1217a), which reads as follows: ": *Provided*, That the Board is authorized, subject to the procedures prescribed by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, to place not more than 5 positions in grades 16, 17, or 18 of the General Schedule established by said act, and such positions shall be in addition to the number authorized by said section";

(6) That part of section 606 of the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1952 (65 Stat. 600; Public Law 188, 82d Cong.), which reads as follows: "The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place 2 positions in grade GS–18, and 7 positions in grade GS–17, in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, and such positions shall be in lieu of any positions in the Federal Bureau of Investigation previously allocated under section 505.";

(7) That part of the paragraph under the heading "Federal Bureau of Investigation" and under the subheading "Salaries and Expenses" contained in title II (the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1953) of the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1953 (66 Stat. 557; Public Law 495, 82d Cong.; 5 U. S. C., sec. 300e), which reads as follows: ": *Provided further*, That the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation hereafter is authorized, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, to place 20 positions in grade GS–16 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949";

(8) Section 806 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954 (67 Stat. 429; Public Law 207, 83d Cong.);

(9) Section 737 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 357; Public Law 458, 83d Cong.; 5 U. S. C., sec. 171d–2);

(10) That part of the paragraph under the heading "Bureau of the Budget" contained in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 273; Public Law 428, 83d Cong.; 31 U. S. C., sec. 16b), which reads as follows: ": *Provided*, That the Bureau of the Budget is authorized, without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, to place 2 additional positions in grade GS–18 and 2 additional positions in grade GS–17 of the General Schedule established by said act";

(11) That part of the paragraph under the heading "Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation" contained in chapter VIII of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 818; Public Law 663, 83d Cong.; 33 U. S. C., sec. 984a), which reads as follows: "; and the Administrator is authorized, subject to the procedures prescribed by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, to place not more than four positions in grades 16, 17, or 18 of the General Schedule established by said act, and such positions shall be in addition to the number authorized by said section";

(12) That part of the paragraph under the heading "President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization" contained in chapter IV of the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954 (68 Stat. 25; Public Law 304, 83d Cong.), which reads as follows: ": *Provided*, That the Committee is authorized, without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, to place

1 position in grade GS–17 of the General Schedule established by said act";

(13) That part of section 602 (a) of the act entitled "An act to provide for greater stability in agriculture; to augment the marketing and disposal of agricultural products; and for other purposes," approved August 28, 1954 (68 Stat. 908; Public Law 690, 83d Congress; 7 U. S. C., sec. 1762 (a)), which reads as follows: ", and the Secretary of Agriculture may place not to exceed 8 positions in grade 16 and 2 in grade 17 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, in accordance with the standards and procedures of that act and such positions shall be in addition to the number authorized in section 505 of that act";

(14) Section 228 of the National Housing Act (68 Stat. 609; 12 U. S. C., sec. 1702a);

(15) The second paragraph of section 606 of the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1952 (65 Stat. 601; Public Law 188, 82d Cong.; 5 U. S. C., sec. 152c);

(16) That part of the third proviso of the first paragraph under the heading "General Provisions" contained in chapter XI of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952 (66 Stat. 121; Public Law 375, 82d Cong.; 5 U. S. C., secs. 245a, 295b, 483–1, 592a–2, 611c), which reads as follows: "shall be placed in the highest grade set forth in the general schedule of such act without regard to section 505 (b) of such act, as amended, and shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grade under such section,"; and

(17) That part of the paragraph under the heading "United States section, St. Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers" contained in chapter IX of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954 (68 Stat. 90; Public Law 357, 83d Cong.), which reads as follows: "*Provided*, That, subject to the procedures prescribed by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, but without regard to the numerical limitations contained therein, one position under the United States section of said Joint Board of Engineers may hereafter be placed in grade GS–16 in the General Schedule established by that act:".

(18) That part of section 3 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952, effective March 15, 1952 (66 Stat. 823; 5 U. S. C., sec. 133z–15 note), which reads as follows: ", except that the compensation may be fixed without regard to the numerical limitations on positions set forth in section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1105)";

(19) That part of section 4 (a) of Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952, effective July 1, 1952 (66 Stat. 826), which reads as follows: ", except that the compensation for not to exceed 15 such offices at any 1 time may be fixed without regard to the numerical limitations on positions set forth in section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U. S. C. 1105)"; and

(20) That part of section 1 (d) of Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953, effective August 1, 1953 (67 Stat. 642; 5 U. S. C., sec. 133z–15 note), which reads as follows: ", except that the compensation may be fixed without regard to the numerical limitations on positions set forth in section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1105)".

SEC. 13. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, this act shall take effect as of the first day of the first pay period which began after February 28, 1955.

(b) This section and sections 8, 10, 11, and 12, shall take effect on the date of enactment of this act.

(c) For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this act shall be held and considered to be effective as of the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of such enactment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, agree to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. JENNER conferees on the part of the Senate.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6042) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 12 minutes to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it is not with great ease that I disagree with my good friend, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. He and I have much in common in that we both have a high and deep regard for the United States Air Force. But, Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator has brought the President's name into the picture, I think it is proper at this time, that we look at the record.

Before I refer to this particular part of the record I should like to say that I agree with the Senator from Missouri that we need unification in our armed services; but I suggest that if we approach the question at hand with the idea that it is a pie to be divided into three parts, we do not promote unification, but get further and further away from it.

The Senator from Missouri spoke of testimony which the President gave in 1950. There was a man speaking as a civilian and speaking in peacetime. Who could foresee Korea in 1948 or in 1949? Certainly, very few people in this country dreamed that the time might come when we would be engaged in hostilities in Korea, and not the least were those who were charged with responsibility for the management of our Air Force, because in 1947, when that organization became a separate unit, it had 305,000 men at full strength, and in 1950 that figure had been increased only to 411,000.

If President Eisenhower is to be charged with responsibility for the failure to have an adequate Air Force in the Korean war, I think we should look at the record of the Air Force as it was then conducted. At the outset of the Korean war we had no fighter force. We were using outmoded F–51's. At Kelly Field there are literally thousands of those aircraft "pickled," as we call it. Some of them had to be shipped overseas. President Eisenhower did not order those airplanes to be "pickled." He did not say not to send F–80 outfits to Korea. We were using what I would term experimental aircraft, the F–82. Certainly, President Eisenhower did not recommend that.

In the light-bomber field we had obsolete B–26's, made over from airplanes used in World War II. All the B–29's, with the exception of those which were used in this country, were "pickled" and standing on the desert near Tucson, Ariz. Certainly the President did not recommend that they be withheld from the use of our Air Force.

We had so neglected our tactical air training that we had to rely upon the always efficient Marine Air Force.

One of the most glaring examples of the misuse of men and equipment in our history occurred in the early stages of the Korean war. At the time of the outbreak we had 84 National Guard squadrons in combat readiness. Of these, 66 squadrons were used for active duty, but only 2 wings of this potential force saw service in northern Japan and in Korea, although all the men did see action in Korea under the rotation system.

I have always felt that had we used the air power embodied in the National Guard at that time the war could have been won in the first 6 months. General Eisenhower or gentleman Eisenhower, or whatever he may have been called at that time, did not say, "Do not send the National Guard air squadron over to Korea."

The Senator from Missouri said in his remarks to the Senate:

> As mentioned, within a few weeks after this testimony we were at war—and within a few months the relatively unprepared military forces of the United States had suffered the worst defeat in the history of our country.

President Eisenhower did not tell General MacArthur to stop; neither did President Eisenhower tell General Clark to stop. But someone in the preceding administration, someone in Washington, stopped the Unitel States from winning a military victory in Korea. I think that some day those guilty will have to be brought to task. But I do not like to see President Eisenhower charged with any of the reverses in Korea, when he personally had nothing at all to do with them.

We read on page 5 of the speech delivered by the junior Senator from Missouri that—

> Also during 1953, 1954, and 1955, we continued, and are continuing, to cut our military strength heavily.

That does not jibe with the actual figures. It does if one does not take into consideration the total military strength, but we should recognize that there has been unification. It is time that we in the United States recognize that the chief strength of our national strategy is our Air Force, and that we have our other forces as requisites of the Air Force.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a table printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Air Force appropriations and wing strength

Fiscal year	New obligating authority [1]	Authorized end-year strength [2]	Actual end-year strength
	Millions		
1950	$4,596	58 groups	48 groups.
1951	15,896	87 (95-wing program)	87 wings.
1952	22,265	95 (more than 95-wings program)	95 wings.
1953	20,346	128 (143-wing program)	106 wings.
1954	11,409	115 (120-wing interim program)	115 wings.
1955	11,558	120 (137-wing program)	121 (estimated).
1956 [3]	14,530	131 (137-wing program)	

[1] Includes cash and contract authorization.
[2] Authorized strengths are those strengths programed for the end of the fiscal year at the time the last appropriations acts were passed for that fiscal year.
There has been only one actual authorization act as distinguished from appropriations acts. This was Public Law 604, July 10, 1950, which authorized 70 groups. Before the end of that fiscal year, however, Congress had appropriated money for 87 wings toward the 95-wing program.
[3] Recommended by the President. It does not include funds for real-estate acquisition and construction to be submitted at a later date. Air Force will probably receive an additional $900 million for these purposes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, since 1953 when the Republican administration came into office, the size of the Air Force has increased from 106 wings to 124 wings. By the end of 1956 it should reach the estimated 131 wings of a 137-wing program.

It is time that Americans, especially American military planners, looked to the Air Force as the center of our national strategy.

Field Marshal Montgomery, who is one of the greatest experts in the conduct of land warfare, has recently said there will be three phases in a future war.

The first phase, which will last 1 day, will involve the question of air superiority.

The second phase, which will last another 24 hours, will be the destruction of strategic targets in the enemy area.

The third phase, which likewise should last 1 day, will be the threat of overwhelming airpower in the execution of any cease-fire or armistice which may be offered.

I speak with all respect for my friend from Missouri. As I said before, I know he shares my interest in this organization. We have heard too much talk throughout the country in the last 2 weeks to the effect that the United States might have a second-rate Air Force. I do not believe the Russians are midgets, 3 feet high, with brains the size of a pea; neither do I think the Russians are 9 feet tall, with brains the size of a bucket. I think they are ordinary people—people like ourselves.

If we can build supersonic jet fighters, so can they. If we can build intercontinental jet bombers, so can they. I think that whatever we can do, they can do.

When previous wars have started, we were at a decided disadvantage in weapons. But I submit that if war ever comes between these two great countries—and we hope it will never come—there will be pretty much of a standoff in the matter of weapons.

In connection with the question of airpower, I wish to call attention to this factor: The Russians have never dropped a strategic bomb. If someone says, "That is nothing; anyone can drop a bomb"; then I suggest that the person who makes such a statement would not know anything of the hundreds of thousands of men and the endless hours, days, and weeks of planning which go into the dropping of one strategic bomb.

So far as I know, the Russians have never engaged in the practice of midair refueling. That is something in which the United States excels.

I end my statement by calling the attention of the Senate to the fact that wars are won by men. Men have always won our wars. In the past we may have entered wars with inferior equipment; but we will not enter any future war with inferior equipment.

When we hear persons in high places criticize our Air Force, we ought to think of the feeling of the boy who sits at the radarscope in the front of a B–47 for 16, 20, or 24 hours. He must think, "Why should I spend my time doing this, when persons in high places belittle my efforts and say that the United States has a second-rate Air Force, that it does not have a prime Air Force?"

It does harm to the personnel of our armed services for us to criticize on the basis of weapons, when we should be calling attention instead to the history of the strength of our manpower, which has grown through the years. We should be encouraging the men in the armed services, instead of criticizing them.

I suggest to the Senator from Missouri that if he wants to help improve the picture, he and his colleagues should join in a determined effort to have the Reserve bill pass the Senate, because our country cannot hope to continue to win wars, if it declares them without adequate Reserves, even though the wars be only of 2 or 3 days duration.

A real Reserve bill will mean the difference between success or failure in a war to keep the peace of the world.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE GREAT FALLS, MONT., HIGH SCHOOL BAND

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] 1 minute on the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I know that the Members of the Senate are aware of the fact that high school students from surrounding States come to Washington every spring. But it is seldom that a group of high school students, especially members of an outstanding high school band comes from the Far West and, incidentally, from my old home town of Great Falls, Mont., to visit the Nation's Capital. The Congress of the United States is indeed fortunate to have had this band give an outstanding concert on the Capitol steps this morning.

I am proud, honored, and privileged that in the gallery at this time are members of the Great Falls, Mont., high school band, some 82 in number, under the talented leadership of Mr. Paul Shull. They are accompanied by 21 chaperons from Montana.

This is one of the outstanding high school bands in the entire country. They have been honored by invitation to appear before the Lions International Convention at Atlantic City. The Lions Clubs of Great Falls and Montana, and the citizens of Great Falls and vicinity have generously subscribed an amount sufficient to make this trip possible.

I should like to ask the members of this outstanding band to rise and receive the greetings of the Senate. We, of Montana, are very proud of them and their accomplishments.

(The members of the band rose and were greeted with applause, Senators rising.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a comment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. As I returned to the Capitol this morning, I heard the band playing. Someone asked me, "What band is that?"

I replied, "I do not know, but it sounds to me like the Army Band."

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator, in behalf of the Great Falls high school band, and want to assure him we appreciate his remarks. Personally, I thought the comparison should have been with the United States Marine Band because of the affinity to John Philip Sousa between the two groups.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list of the members of the band.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE GREAT FALLS, MONT., HIGH SCHOOL BAND

(Leader: Mr. Paul Shull)

GIRLS

Alene Altenbach, Laverna Jones, Phyllis Snodgrass, Mrs. Mundale, Marilyn Olsen, JoAnne Tesarek, Sharon Emmett, Mrs. Dehon, Barbara Landgren, Jordis Erickson, Kathy Goudie, Mrs. Whyte, Myrel Ensley, Jill Bateman, Sharon Pellett, Mrs. Olson, Sandi Knudsen, Donna Davis, Dolly Mears, Mrs. Roberts, Sharon McLaughlin, Ruth Grandy, Shirley Vukasin, Mrs. Altenbach, Joyce McDonah, Pennee Kuno, Marjorie White, Mrs. Tonkovich, Karen Weismann, Joan Welch,

Pat Washburn, Mrs. Shull, Faith Petty, Ylonne Stevenson, Joanne Bazal, Mrs. Bachelder, Stacey Barkhurst, Suzanne Hawkes, Lynn Hemsing, Mrs. Hemsing, Bev Mundale, Shirley Remsh, Shirley Gillette, Janice Remsh, Judy Crago, Maxine Nordby, Mrs. Hilde, Ardis Jarrett, Carol Kugelard, Pat Mann, Ruth Jones, Carol Hautala, Joan Blanchard, Mrs. Knudsen.

BOYS

Gary Hindoein, Keith Good, Jack Tonkovich, Mr. Shull, Don Dehon, Duane Threlkeld, Ted Hodges, Mr. Threlkeld, Lee Foster, Chuck Pannage, Bob Makela, Mr. Roberts, Larry Holtz, Dave Sebens, Harold Stephens, Mr. Bachelder, David Hilde, Jack Holtzberger, Irving Weissman, Mr. Dehon, Don Holm, Jerry Polich, Lyle Thomas, Lowell Wandke, Glenn Whyte, Bob Lingscheit, Bob Lindquist, Mr. Tonkovich, Dan Lesh, Jack Weber, Phil Gerhart, Mr. Altenbach, Joe Roberts, Bob Gray, Bill Rogers, Leroy Waugh, David Baker, Duane Olson, Tom Annau, Larry Nemec, Russ Lindquist, Joel McVey, Dayton Misfeldt, Mr. Olson, Dan Bachelder, Wayne Simpson, John Olson, Mr. Mundale.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR D. WORTH CLARK

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, it is with a sense of sorrow and deep sadness that I announce to the Senate the death of David Worth Clark, of Boise, Idaho, who formerly served in the United States Senate with honor and dignity.

Senator Clark first came to Washington as a United States Representative. He then became a United States Senator. He was born in Idaho Falls, Bonneville County, Idaho, on April 2, 1902, the son of a prominent family and nephew of one of Idaho's greatest families. He attended the public school of Idaho Falls.

Later he was graduated from the University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Ind. Following that, he was graduated from the law department of Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., in 1925.

The late Senator William E. Borah held Senator Clark in high esteem—even though of opposite political faith Senator Clark was known as a protege of Senator Borah.

He was assistant attorney general of Idaho from 1933 to 1935, when he was elected, as a Democrat, to the 74th and 75th Congresses, and served from January 3, 1935, to January 3, 1939. He did not seek renomination to the House of Representatives because he was a successful candidate for the United States Senate, having been elected to the Senate in 1938.

He served in the Senate from January 3, 1939, to January 3, 1945.

Mr. President, I doubt that in the history of politics there has been a more friendly, nicer, kinder campaign than that which I was privileged to enjoy when I sought to defeat this able statesman. We used to meet in different places of Idaho and have luncheon and breakfast together. His spirit of campaigning was simply this: Let me win if I can, but only on high-minded principles. Our friendship never lessened, and I am flattered to say that D. Worth Clark visited me personally on his many trips to Washington, D. C.

There are many Members of the Senate who served with Worth Clark. I know their hearts are filled with sympathy for his lovely widow, Virgil, and his charming daughters and their children who have respectively suffered the loss of a fine husband, father, and grandfather.

Mr. President, Idaho has lost a great statesman in the passing of D. Worth Clark. Most assuredly I have lost a true friend.

Death cannot kill that which never dies, so we have some consolation in knowing that the benefits resulting from his untiring work for the State of Idaho and the Nation will not be lost. This Nation needs men like D. Worth Clark, who came from one of the great pioneering families of the State of Idaho.

I am sure that God in his infinite wisdom will richly reward his faithful servant, D. Worth Clark.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in expressing profound sorrow over the passing of former Senator D. Worth Clark, of Idaho. For a quarter of a century I had been acquainted with the late Senator, and although we belonged to opposing political parties, I always found him to be a formidable champion of sound political principles as a conservative Democrat.

During the years from 1939 to 1945, when he served as a Senator from Idaho, I was a Member of the House of Representatives, and we had occasion to cooperate frequently in promoting the interests and welfare of our State. Senator Clark's services in the Congress were characterized by a fearless independence which won him wide acclaim. This was particularly true when he was serving in the House of Representatives and joined in active opposition to the ill-fated court-packing plan of 1937.

Senator Clark came from a family which won distinction in public service and he upheld that tradition by his devoted service to his country as a public official. I join with colleagues of the late Senator and with his host of friends in Idaho in expressing our sorrow, and in extending condolences to his family on the passing of a distinguished American.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Idaho regarding the late Senator Clark. He was a personal friend of mine, with whom I went on several interesting fishing trips into the beautiful State of Idaho. I join in the tribute to former Senator Clark, and in the condolences to the late Senator's family and friends.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6042) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much time remains to each side on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader has 12 minutes remaining, and the minority leader has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	Monroney
Allott	Gore	Morse
Barkley	Hayden	Mundt
Barrett	Hennings	Neely
Beall	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bender	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bennett	Holland	Pastore
Bible	Hruska	Payne
Bricker	Ives	Purtell
Bush	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Carlson	Kilgore	Scott
Case, N. J.	Knowland	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Lehman	Sparkman
Daniel	Long	Stennis
Douglas	Magnuson	Symington
Duff	Malone	Thurmond
Dworshak	Mansfield	Thye
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Watkins
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Welker
Flanders	McCarthy	Wiley
Frear	McClellan	Williams
Fulbright	McNamara	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is absent by leave of the Senate until June 21, 1955, on behalf of the Senate Appropriations Committee to conduct an on-the-spot study of specific matters relating to our foreign-aid program.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the United Nations anniversary celebration in San Francisco as a representative of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is unavoidably absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent on official business for the Committee on Appropriations.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the funeral of a friend.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the minority leader.

Mr. President, the pending amendment relates to the Marine Corps. No one can be more enthusiastic than I am about the Marine Corps. Our problem is to make the Marine Corps as efficient as possible in carrying out the President's program.

I wish to point out 1 or 2 facts which I believe are very important and are not generally known.

In reducing the Marine Corps from 205,000 to 195,000 men, no trained men will be dropped. When the change is made there will be 3 marine divisions which will be 100-percent manned, and there will be 3 marine air wings which will be 80-percent manned. In fact, they will be fully manned air wings, except in case of actual warfare, because in time of peace the ammunition carriers and similar personnel are not required. The Reserves will be increased by 19,000 men as compared to the strength of the Reserves in December 1954. Those figures are without regard to whether we pass or do not enact a new Reserve law.

As the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] knows, because he was a member of the Marine Corps, it is important for us to remember that the marines are integrated by individuals, not by units, so that if one individual falls out, he is replaced by a man from the Reserves.

At the present time the Korean war is over, and the marine division which was in Korea has been returned to the United States. A part of it is in Hawaii; and 1 division is on the Atlantic coast, and 1 is on the Pacific coast.

We must also remember that if an emergency is declared troops will not be moved overnight. Our first defense will be the stategic bombers. It will take a few days or a few weeks to determine where our ground troops, such as the marines, can be used. During that time we can build up the Marine Corps, which now has 3 divisions 100-percent manned; and we can build up the air wings of the Marine Corps, 3 of which are now 80-percent manned. They can be built up to full strength pending the time when our troops are called upon to move into fighting areas.

Furthermore, we must remember that the Marine Corps will have the benefit of atomic power, if and when any battles are fought.

So the most important thing for us to remember is that there will not be a decrease in the operating troops in the Marine Corps. Instead, the 3 Marine Corps divisions will be kept 100 percent manned, and the 3 Marine Corps air wings will be kept 80 percent manned. We should also remember that the Reserves are being brought in as individuals, not as units. Furthermore, our Marine divisions are now available as mobile troops, because they are no longer in Korea.

We must consider whether, under the circumstances, our defense funds can best be used by providing for an increased number of marines, or by providing for additions to other branches of the military service. On this question, we have the benefit of the judgment of the President of the United States. Under all the circumstances, what Member of this body can say his judgment is equal to that of the President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I should like to congratulate the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON for the fight he has made on this issue during the past 3 years.

Let me state that when General Shepherd testified before the committee, he said, in part, in speaking of the Marine Corps:

> Operationally, the effect of these actions will be to diminish somewhat the staying power of our combat forces, because of reduced depth in personnel and supporting units.

A little later, in reply to a question which was asked him by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], General Shepherd said:

> We can maintain those 3 divisions, but we will have very little backup for them; the supply, the logistics, the artillery, backup that you will need in sustained combat.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think General Shepherd's testimony justifies the adoption of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri, which I shall support.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I join the Senators who oppose the proposed reduction in the Marine Corps.

Several Members of this body, of whom I am one, have had the privilege of serving in the Marine Corps; and those who have served in it are aware of the very intensive, comprehensive, and thorough training its members receive, and know that as a result, the members of the Marine Corps are really professional soldiers.

As has been explained by the able Senator from Massachusetts, the Marine Corps is composed of real career soldiers, insofar as their professional status is concerned.

It makes no sense to me, Mr. President, to propose a reduction of 22,000 in the number of well-trained, professional men in the Marine Corps, and then to propose that 10,000 men be drafted—a proposal which we learn from the newspapers was just announced as the quota for next month. In other words, it makes no sense, as I see the matter, to reduce by 22,000 the professional soldiers in the Marine Corps, and to increase by 10,000 the men who reluctantly, at best, serve in the Armed Forces. In short, how can it be said that we are acting wisely, if we spend the time, money, and effort required to train 22,000 of the professional soldiers who now are in the Marine Corps, where they are able to serve most efficiently, and then turn around and spend the same amount of money and the same amount of energy and the same amount of time—spend them all over again—in trying to train new men, drafted men, to do the same job? To me, that simply does not make sense.

If we are to err in this matter, about which there is some difference of opinion, certainly it is better to err in the direction of having too much too soon, rather than in having too little too late, which in the past has unfortunately been our custom.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The proposed reduction will be 12,000, not 22,000; and not one marine who wants to stay in the service will be discharged.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I could hardly disagree more with the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield an additional one-half minute to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for an additional one-half minute.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, as I recall, General Shepherd himself said that the proposed reduction would amount to 22,000 men. In the committee, there was a discussion of the effect of the proposed reduction in strength upon the capabilities of the Marine forces. In discussing that point, General Shepherd said:

> In the discussion of our personnel strengths a question may have arisen in your minds concerning the effect of the reductions upon the capabilities of the Fleet Marine Forces. It is manifest that reductions of the magnitude with which we are confronted involve some sacrifice.

So, Mr. President, the making of such a reduction will hurt in terms of the capabilities of the Marine forces.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in the committee I offered an amendment similar to the one now pending; but it was rejected. However, I hope that following the explanation which has been made on the floor, the amendment will be agreed to.

I wish to say that I have long been familiar with the Marine Corps, for I helped to bring the great Gen, John A. Lejeune to Virginia Military Institute, where he served as Superintendent, following his service as Commandant of the Marine Corps. Furthermore, my son served for 2 years in the Marine Corps, during the Korean war. In short, Mr. President, I have been in close touch with the Marine Corps for a period of 35 years.

Now it is proposed that the number of trained, experienced men in the Marine Corps—veterans, if you please—be reduced by 22,000. If that should be done, then in combat the marines would not have sustained power, as the Commandant of the Marine Corps has said.

Mr. President, many persons are disturbed about the proposals to make reductions in the strength of the Marine Corps and also in the strength of other components of our military forces.

The pending bill, as reported to the Senate, is $396,293,664 below the revised budget estimates for the fiscal year 1956. The total amount of the bill as reported to the Senate is in excess of $31 billion. Therefore, Mr. President, to increase that amount by $38 million plus will neither make nor break us.

Let me say that I am not critical of the President for favoring the proposed reductions in the case of the marines and the Army, even though his Chiefs of Staff do not approve the making of such reductions. The President was depending on the Congress to give him a worthwhile reserve training law, but Congress has not yet done so. Such a law may or may not be enacted.

If, in connection with this bill, Congress provides for more manpower than is needed, the President can impound the surplus money. But so far as I can determine from the evidence which is before us, although we have made progress in the direction of achieving a proper defense status, it has not yet been achieved. So, Mr. President, it will be prudent for us to adopt the pending amendment, and thus refuse to have the strength of the Marine Corps reduced in the amount proposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, this matter has been gone into thoroughly by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, by the responsible heads of our service departments, by the National Security Council, and by the President. It was their recommendation that the figure reported by the Appropriations Committee be the one included in the bill.

I think all of us have a very high regard for the United States Marines. But I submit that on this issue, with respect to which the responsible heads of the executive department of the Government, who have responsibility for the defense of the country, have come to us with well-developed plans and recommendations, their recommendations should be sustained.

I hope that the provision which was reported by the Appropriations Committee will be sustained by the Senate, and that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in the record of hearings before the Committee on Appropriations we have the benefit not only of the testimony of General Shepherd, but of other members of the Armed Forces who appeared before the committee. If I were a military leader, in command of foot troops, I, too, would want a large number of men. That is characteristic of military leaders. But when we take into consideration the entire budgetary situation and the defense needs, in the light of the statement of General Shepherd, there is no question that we shall have in service every marine who desires to remain in service, whether he be a private or a noncommissioned officer.

If we have a good Reserve in the Air Force, the Navy, the Marines, and the Army, we have a manpower pool to draw from. As indicated by General Shepherd in the record, the Reserve program is moving forward more speedily and more efficiently than was hoped for a year ago. Had we proceeded 3 years ago, or even 2 years ago, to build the number of B–36 type bombers which were said to be necessary, we would have an inventory of obsolete planes today, rather than an assembly line, including the tools, dies, and skilled mechanics to operate it. Today we have plant capacity which could be stepped up to twice the present output if there were a sudden need for the most modern type of B–52 planes.

So, Mr. President, in view of the entire budgetary situation, the pending appropriation bill in the provision it makes not only for the construction of planes, but for the guided missile program, and the manpower program, represents a well balanced defense program. We have not only unobligated funds carried over from previous appropriations, but also obligated funds yet to be spent in our defense program.

The committee did well as a result of its deliberations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much time remains on the amendment on each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proponent of the amendment has 6½ minutes. No time remains in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the remaining time on the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I have received from Mr. H. E. Talbott, Secretary of the Air Force, dated June 20, 1955, together with the enclosure.

There being no objection, the letter and enclosure were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, June 20, 1955.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman Armed Services Subcommittee,
Senate Appropriations Committee.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: During my appearance before your committee at the time we were discussing the Air Force budget, I informed you that we felt an increase in the production rate of our heavy bomber, the Boeing B–52, was both advisable and practical. Anticipating such a possibility, we had, as you recall, authorized the establishment of a second source in October 1953, at Wichita, Kans. Recently, we requested additional funds for the purpose of increasing the monthly production rate in both this plant and the first plant located at Seattle Wash. The amount of new money required in fiscal year 1956 was $356 million.

During this same hearing, I informed you that we were then engaged in a review of our aircraft program, and that if, on completion of these studies we felt that any change in our fighter programs was in order and would require additional funds, that we would notify the Secretary of Defense and appropriate committees of Congress to that effect, and advise the nature of the changes contemplated.

As you know, the budget as presented to the Congress is based on technological information and program requirements available during the fall of the year prior to the beginning of the budget period—in other words, about 9 months prior to the time that the budget becomes effective. It has been our policy that prior to the actual placement of procurement orders for the new weapons that additional reviews would be made to determine the extent to which the technical progress anticipated at the time the budget was being prepared has been accomplished or exceeded.

In the case of two of our supersonic fighter aircraft we have, by continuous pressure, achieved more rapid development than was anticipated at the time the budget was prepared. We therefore find that these aircraft are now ready to be placed in quantity production, and we have so recommended to the Secretary of Defense, and are taking this opportunity to advise the Congress.

We have not completed our review of all the elements of the program financed from the appropriation "Aircraft and Related Procurement." Therefore, it is not possible at this time to determine the extent to which additional funds may be needed to finance this program in fiscal year 1956. We see some possibility that all or a substantial part of the funds necessary to accelerate the fighter program can be achieved by appropriate adjustments in other areas financed by this appropriation. If additional funds are needed in fiscal year 1956 to properly support this increase in production of fighters and continue adequate support of other parts of the program, we will make such a recommendation to the Secretary of

Defense and advise your committee of the recommendation prior to the adjournment of this session of Congress.

I would like to call to your attention two items which seem to me to be of great importance. The first is that we do have an industrial structure somewhat larger than is needed to meet our current requirements for aircraft and other weapons. We have carefully planned and preserved this additional capacity and are in a position to step up rates of production of almost all types of aircraft on short notice. For example, we have the F–100, our supersonic tactical fighter and fighter-bomber, in production in two sources and could, should the circumstances require it, substantially increase its output. To some degree this is true of all aircraft that we are procuring under the current program.

The second point, and the one which I consider to be most vital, is that we must emphasize in our planning and in our procurement of weapons those items which will give us the greatest technological lead that is possible. Quality, in the last analysis, has always been our strength, and in this fast-moving technological age, it is our purpose to so plan and direct our affairs as to make the most of the technical assets of this country, and to increase our technological lead to the fullest extent possible.

The program changes which we have previously submitted to you, and which we are presenting above, concentrating as they do on the most advanced types in both the strategic and tactical areas, are steps in that direction. If additional funds are required, I would urge very strongly that they be made available.

For your further information, I am attaching a copy of General Twining's recommendations to me on this subject.

Sincerely yours,

H. E. TALBOTT.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

Subject: Recommendation for accelerated fighter production.

During a recent hearing before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate we disclosed that we were conducting a review of our aircraft production program. The review of the fighter aircraft has been completed, with the following results:

1. The production of our current supersonic fighter and fighter-bomber, the F–100, is at a satisfactory rate. This airplane is being produced in two sources.

2. The production of our all-weather fighter, the F–102, is proceeding satisfactorily, but further acceleration at this time does not appear feasible.

3. It is, however, both feasible and practical to step up production on two new supersonic fighter aircraft, the F–101 and the F–104. Flight tests recently completed indicate that these advanced aircraft are ready for volume production.

As a result of the above, I recommend an increase in production of the F–101 and the F–104 aircraft in fiscal year 1956.

N. F. TWINING.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, someone has truly said that apparently men learn nothing from history except the fact that we learn nothing from history.

On two occasions we have summoned the resources of this Nation. We have not only called upon our wealth, but our flesh and blood, to forge mighty fighting machines which have won two world wars.

Following World War I we brought our boys home and discharged them before the peace was assured, merely because we had won a military victory.

In World War II we organized the most powerful fighting machine ever seen upon the surface of the globe. It was one of the largest, best equipped, best trained, and certainly, by all odds, the most expensive fighting machine, that has ever been assembled. When the war was won we brought our boys home, demobilized them, and took that fighting machine apart, until there was scarcely a chassis left. As a result of this mistake we paid $150 billion and the lives of thousands of our sons in Korea. We had won a war, but had not won the peace. Who can delude himself into thinking that we have won the peace in today's troubled world?

We are preparing to enter into what are called summit negotiations. It has been truly said that negotiations with an enemy, unsupported by military strength, can end only in appeasement. What other end is there when our negotiators are not supported by military strength?

It is peculiarly unfortunate that at this time we are reducing the strength and fighting power of all branches of the armed services. It would be the wisest expenditure we have ever made to maintain them at the present level. We should maintain our strength until the "summit" conferences have been concluded, so that we may see whether an era of peace is about to be ushered in, an era for which the hearts of men everywhere, even behind the Iron Curtain, yearn and pray.

Of all the reductions that have been made in our fighting forces, to me this one is the most inexplicable. The Marine Corps is composed of 100 percent volunteers, men who enter the service through their own choice, because they wish to serve in this elite corps. The Department of Defense actually asks us to refuse to reenlist experienced Marine veterans, and then draft tens of thousands of young men who do not want to be brought into the Armed Forces to fill their places.

I care not who recommends such a program. To me it does not make sense to discharge men who wish to reenlist, and draft others who do not wish to serve. Of course, we are not actually discharging any men. We are merely refusing to reenlist 17,500 of the best trained and most effective fighting men on the globe today, and drafting many more thousands of sons of American mothers into the armed services who are completely untrained.

All the reductions in our defense forces are unfortunate, but this one is tragic. Stronger words might be used to describe it.

It is said that we have three Marine divisions. Yes; we have three Marine divisions, but we have not the necessary Reserve strength for them. If Senators will recall, communiques during World War II referred to "reinforced Marine battalions," "regimental combat teams," "beefed up," or "reinforced" Marine divisions, and so forth. We are asked to strip off the strength that has made the reinforced Marine division and the reinforced regimental combat team invincible.

There is no way on earth to justify the proposed reduction. Senators say: "Remember, these Marines have atomic weapons," as though we had a monopoly on atomic weapons. We know that our principal adversaries have atomic weapons; and if we did not have, we would certainly be in a deplorable position.

It is said, "We have increased the firepower of our ground forces." Of course we have; but we know that our enemies have likewise increased theirs. Indeed, the so-called "burp" gun which they use in street fighting and close infighting has been something about which we have learned, to our sorrow, paying for that knowledge in blood and sacrifices.

We propose to increase foreign aid by $300 million for next year. But it is said that we should not increase appropriations for the Marine Corps by $46 million, so as to maintain it in its present status.

We are not trying to increase anything. Senators say that we are seeking an increase. We are not seeking an increase. We are trying to hold onto what we have today, namely, a force of volunteers, the greatest fighting men under our flag. We should not take the step of reducing the strength of the Marine Corps. We should hold it where it is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	Monroney
Allott	Gore	Morse
Barkley	Hayden	Mundt
Barrett	Hennings	Neely
Beall	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bender	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bennett	Holland	Pastore
Bible	Hruska	Payne
Bricker	Ives	Purtell
Bush	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Carlson	Kilgore	Scott
Case, N. J.	Knowland	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Lehman	Sparkman
Daniel	Long	Stennis
Douglas	Magnuson	Symington
Duff	Malone	Thurmond
Dworshak	Mansfield	Thye
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Watkins
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Welker
Flanders	McCarthy	Wiley
Frear	McClellan	Williams
Fulbright	McNamara	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the senior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], earlier this afternoon addressed the Senate on the defense appropriations for the fiscal year ending 1956. His statement was most timely and provocative, and at the same time soberly thoughtful. His acute analysis has provided the country with a brief but clear vision on a subject always at best complex and difficult, but which the Eisenhower administration has allowed to become murky and confused.

Some columnists have recently indicated that the conclusion was not wholely unintended.

In any case on the basis of the brilliant analysis by the junior Senator from Missouri, it appears that it would be most unwise at this critical point in our Nation's history to grant President Eisenhower's request for heavy reductions in our Army and Marine Corps to take effect in the fiscal year 1956.

My distinguished colleague stated forcefully that the Eisenhower administration has attempted to justify the drastic reductions in these ground forces on the basis of an alleged degree of Air Force supremacy over the Russian not supported by facts recently revealed at the Moscow air show.

In a column appearing in yesterday's paper, the noted Washington newspaper columnist, Joseph Alsop, recited facts which, if true, are a shocking indictment against President Eisenhower and his administration. Mr. Alsop suggested that if Chiang Kai-shek can be cajoled or bully-ragged into cooperating, Quemoy and the Matsu Islands are eventually to be given to the Chinese Communists as the Tachen Islands were given—on a silver platter. He suggests this might be the best way out of a bad business. On this I am not informed. In any case, he says the consequences are likely to be appallingly unpleasant; and in the second place, this action will result from what he terms "the most incredible mismanagement in the entire history of American postwar diplomacy."

First, we had in January 1953 President Eisenhower's dramatic announcement that he had just unleashed Chiang Kai-shek. At that time, all of the offshore islands were lightly occupied by the Chinese Nationalists, and all were frankly regarded as entirely expendable. But the Eisenhower administration forced Chiang to fortify the islands heavily. Then, when the Chinese Communists prepared an attack in the Formosa Strait, the President vetoed any guaranty of American aid in defending any offshore island. In January 1954, instead of defending no islands at all, we were to help in the defense of Quemoy and Matsu if Chiang would evacuate the Tachens. Later came the turnabout, when Chiang was told that President Eisenhower would not guarantee Quemoy and Matsu. This is the same kind of big talk and pusillanimous action which so characterized the Eisenhower administration on the occasion of the Dienbienphu-Geneva debacle.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my statement, an article by Joseph Alsop, which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Sunday, June 19, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR-ACT DRAMA ON TURNING ONE'S BACK

(By Joseph Alsop)

According to report, no decisive business was done between the President, Secretary of State Dulles, and V. K. Krishna Menon. But only 3 months ago this double emissary of Pandit Nehru and Chou En-lai would have been about as popular in Washington as poison ivy at a picnic.

So the amiable and even distinguished reception that has been given Menon can be said to speak volumes.

In particular, it seems to prove what has long been suspected. If Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek can be cajoled or bully-ragged into cooperating, Quemoy and the Matsu Islands are eventually to be given to the Chinese Communists as the Tachen Islands were given—on a silver platter.

On balance, perhaps, this is the best way out of a bad business. But two things about it must be clearly understood in advance. In the first place, the consequences are likely to be appallingly unpleasant. And, in the second place, those consequences will be the direct results of the most incredible mismanagement in the entire history of American postwar diplomacy.

The chief consequences of handing over Quemoy and the Matsus are not to be looked for in Japan and South Asia, as so many people suppose. But there will be grave repercussions on Formosa, where the Generalissimo's regime will be shaken to its foundations.

And, above all, the consequences in Peiping will be extraordinarily dangerous. If they get the offshore islands as a present the Chinese Communists will be finally and unshakably convinced that America really is a paper tiger.

Thereafter, nothing short of an American bullet through Chou En-lai's head will ever again convince the Peiping leaders that the Eisenhower administration means business.

This is known as a strange drama of tergiversation in four fantastic acts. The first act opened in January 1953 with President Eisenhower's dramatic announcement that he had just unleashed Chiang Kai-shek.

At that time all the offshore islands were very lightly occupied by the Chinese Nationalists, and all were frankly regarded as entirely expendable. But the heaviest American pressure was put on the unfortunate and highly reluctant Chiang to make him occupy the little islands in heavy force. The purpose was to give some substance to the much-touted unleashing.

The result was to make Chiang commit his own and his Government's prestige to the hilt.

Act two took place last summer and autumn. The Chinese Communists were now visibly preparing an attack in the Formosa Strait. The question therefore arose whether we would aid Chiang to defend the islands where we had persuaded him to commit himself. Three of the four Joint Chiefs of Staff said "Yes."

At the famous Security Council meeting in Denver in late September, the President said "No." The Formosa Treaty was therefore negotiated to exclude any American aid in defending any offshore islands.

Act 3 took place in January. For reasons which are still mysterious, the September decision of the National Security Council was suddenly altered. Now, instead of defending no islands at all, we were to help in the defense of Quemoy and the Matsus, if the Generalissimo would evacuate the Tachens.

This change of American policy was formally communicated to the Formosa Government by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, through Chinese Foreign Minister George Yeh. The Formosa resolution, authorizing the President to use American forces to defend "any area essential" to the security of Formosa, was then before the Congress.

Dulles told Yeh that if the Generalissimo would abandon the Tachen Islands, the President would publicly declare that Quemoy and the Matsus were "essential" to Formosa's security as soon as the Formosa resolution had been passed.

Dulles further gave Yeh a written minute of this verbal communication, which amounted to a promise of a Presidential guaranty of the offshore islands. On the basis of this minute, when the Formosa resolution was finally approved, the American Ambassador in Taipeh, Karl Rankin, actually told a press conference that Quemoy and the Matsus would be guaranteed over the weekend. But, meanwhile, act 4 was already beginning.

Almost as Rankin spoke to the press, Assistant Secretary of State Walter Robertson was explaining to the dumbfounded Yeh that there had been a little misunderstanding between the President and his Secretary of State. The President, it seemed, was not going to guarantee Quemoy and the Matsus after all.

Meanwhile, however, nothing was done to stop the big, bold talk about defending Quemoy and the Matsus by other leaders of the administration. That bluff went on till the famous Admiral Carney dinner in April.

Consider this history. The abandonment of Quemoy and the Matsus would do little damage on Formosa, if it had not been for acts 1 and 2 of the foregoing drama. It would do little damage in Peiping, either, if it had not been for acts 3 and 4.

These acts repeated the pattern of big, bold talk followed by slow surrender that was traced out by the administration leadership in the Dien Bien Phu-Geneva period. After this double demonstration of phoniness, why on earth should Peiping worry, no matter what America says?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the question is on the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If a Senator wishes to vote in favor of adding $46 million to the bill for the Marine Corps, he should vote "yea"; if he is opposed, he should vote "nay." Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. YOUNG (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

• Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and

the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is absent by leave of the Senate until June 21, 1955, on behalf of the Senate Appropriations Committee to conduct an on-the-spot study of specific matters relating to our foreign aid program.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the United Nations anniversary celebration in San Francisco as a representative of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is unavoidably absent.

On this vote, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] has a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has a general pair with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER].

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] has a pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

I also announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent on official business for the Committee on Appropriations.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the funeral of a friend. His pair with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] has been previously announced.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS].

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] has a general pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

On this vote, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay" and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—40

Barkley	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Bible	Kefauver	Neuberger
Byrd	Kennedy	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Kilgore	Pastore
Daniel	Langer	Robertson
Douglas	Lehman	Russell
Ervin	Long	Scott
Frear	Magnuson	Smathers
Fulbright	Mansfield	Sparkman
Gore	McCarthy	Stennis
Hayden	McClellan	Symington
Hennings	McNamara	Wiley
Hill	Monroney	
Johnson, Tex.	Morse	

NAYS—39

Aiken	Curtis	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Duff	Mundt
Barrett	Dworshak	Payne
Beall	Flanders	Purtell
Bender	Goldwater	Saltonstall
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Bricker	Holland	Smith, Maine
Bush	Hruska	Smith, N. J.
Butler	Ives	Thurmond
Capehart	Knowland	Thye
Carlson	Kuchel	Watkins
Case, N. J.	Malone	Welker
Case, S. Dak.	Martin, Iowa	Williams

NOT VOTING—17

Anderson	Ellender	Kerr
Bridges	George	Millikin
Clements	Green	Murray
Cotton	Humphrey	Potter
Dirksen	Jackson	Young
Eastland	Jenner	

So Mr. SYMINGTON's amendments were agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

IT IS ESSENTIAL TO EXPAND AIRPOWER

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there has been a very interesting discussion this afternoon of the status of the air power of the United States. I recognize how difficult it is to offer an amendment from the floor of the Senate which varies from the amount reported by the Appropriations Committee. As a former member of that committee I am aware of the diligence with which the committee works and of the amount of information which it receives. I am not asking additional funds but I am asking that the funds appropriated be used.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming wish to offer an amendment at this time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my amendment is upon the desk, and I was about to ask that it be read, but I wished the Senate to know for what purpose the amendment is to be offered. If the clerk will be good enough to read the amendment which I have sent to the desk——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 25, line 9, after the period, it is proposed to insert the following:

It is the sense of the Congress that the funds herein appropriated for aircraft and related procurement shall be obligated and expended as speedily as possible consistently with proven technological developments to the end that the United States shall not fall behind any nation in the world in air power.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I want to emphasize the purpose of this amendment. It is to require the Department to make the contracts for expanding air power for which we are making the money available.

The problem of what we shall do to defend this Nation in the air has been before the Congress for many years, and the battle between those who have desired to balance the budget rather than to provide air defense has continued for many years. I remember very well a period some 6 years ago when only 9 Members of this body voted to eliminate a reduction below the budget which had been made by the House of Representatives. The argument in favor of the reduction at that time was that the expansion of airpower was not needed. There can be no doubt, particularly after listening to the speech of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], that Congress is now faced with making a decision as to whether or not we desire to maintain control of the air. In view of the fact that the cold war is not ended and no one in this Chamber, no one in the House of Representatives' Chamber, no one in the Government is able to predict what the result of the conference on the so-called Summit will be. This we do know, Mr. President, that Soviet Russia has now built its air fleets far beyond the imagination of our military leaders. No one will now deny that Russia has made strides in building its airpower that no one anticipated. There is every reason to believe that Soviet Russia is better equipped today, so far as airpower is concerned, than is the United States. The question before us is, What are we going to do about it?

At one time it was my duty, through four Congresses or more, to work as a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. In two sessions I was chairman, and I remember very well the time when the late Senator Maybank, of South Carolina, sponsored an amendment to add billions of dollars to the appropriation, far above the budgeted amount, in order that we might have airplanes and guided missiles in far greater numbers than could possibly be constructed by any other nation. At the same time, the gentleman who is now the Ambassador of the United States to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, was a Senator from Massachusetts. He also offered an amendment to increase the appropriation. I am convinced that the failure of the United States to have the airpower for which provision was made has been due to the fact that there is a great misunderstanding in the public press and in Congress with reference to the meaning of an appropriation.

There are Members, I am sorry to say, who sometimes think that when a fund is appropriated, the money suddenly springs into being and is located somewhere in the Treasury, in a safe, or behind bars, ready to be expended. Such is not the case.

There are three categories into which these funds may be divided. First, there is the appropriated funds. That fund, particularly with respect to air power, is the sum Congress authorizes the Executive to spend, well knowing that it cannot all be expended during the fiscal year. It is greater usually than the

amount of money which is obligated during the fiscal year. The amount obligated is also greater than that which is expended because of the lapse of time between the making of a contract and the delivery of the planes.

When the Bureau of the Budget reports that "X billion dollars, appropriated for aircraft and related procurement, has been unexpended," some observers get the idea that too much was appropriated and ask, "Why should we appropriate more money?" They overlook completely the fact that to build an airplane of modern design frequently requires 5 years from the time the design of the plane is put upon the drafting board until the finished plane comes off the production line. Four or five years sometimes more, will have to pass. The result is that although money may have been appropriated and obligated to pay for the plane, it has not been expended because the plane has not been delivered.

So when we see in the report of the Bureau of the Budget that "X billion dollars is unobligated," it means only that the Department of Defense has not made the arrangements to have the planes built. It means only that the Department has not issued the contracts.

Likewise, when we read in the Bureau of the Budget report that "X billion dollars has been unexpended," it means either that the contracts have not been made, or that, even though the contracts have been made, the materials ordered have not yet been delivered.

CONGRESS WANTS ACTION

The purpose of my amendment is to expedite the making of contracts for the building of planes after the contracts are issued. This is the function of the Department of Defense. I want that Department to know that Congress wants action.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I did not quite understand the amendment as it was read by the Senator. I have a copy of the original. As I understand, the amendment does not change any of the money items whatsoever.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite right.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is a declaration of policy for the accelerating of the construction of airplanes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall be delighted to accept the amendment, take it to conference, and fight for it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have consulted about this matter with the senior Senator from New Mexico, with the majority leader, with the minority leader, and with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who is the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations. All of them have indicated to me their willingness to accept the amendment.

The announcement by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations indicates that it is not necessary for me to take any more time in discussing the matter. I shall not do so unless it develops later that an additional explanation may be necessary.

May I ask if the Senator from New Mexico is now willing to accept the amendment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment, to take it to conference, and to fight for it there.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. With that explanation, and there being no opposition, I am, of course, ready to yield the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The ranking minority member of the committee had some question about a part of the language toward the end of the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I made a change in the language of the amendment to accommodate the view of the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is why I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I want to direct attention to the letter of Secretary Talbott of the Department of the Air Force made a part of the RECORD by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. It acknowledges that we have unused industrial capacity. With the money and unused capacity we can expand our air power more rapidly than has been the case the last 2 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time on the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, at the end of line 13, it is proposed to strike out the period, and insert a semicolon and the following proviso:

Provided, That during the fiscal year 1956 the maintenance, operation, and availability of the Army-Navy hospital at Hot Springs National Park, Arkansas, and the Murphy General Hospital in Boston, Mass., to meet requirements of the military and naval forces, shall be continued.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I know the amendment has to do with keeping in operation a hospital in Arkansas and one in Boston, Mass., which are now in use. I do not like to hear of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps, or the Veterans' Administration closing hospitals. The amendment would keep the hospitals going for the present, so I accept the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, if the amendment is accepted——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand the Senator from New Mexico accepted the amendment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I accepted the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas oppose the amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am not going to ask for a yea and nay vote on the amendment, but in view of the fact that the amendment is going to be accepted by the Chairman of the Committee, I think it is important to make a very brief statement. This morning an amendment was accepted relating to a Veterans' Administration hospital. The pending amendment deals with one of the military hospitals in Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And also one in Massachusetts.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And also one in Massachusetts. In view of the fact that the Senate decided to have the other amendment taken to conference, I am quite willing to admit to the Senator from Arkansas that it would present a difficult position if there was a refusal to take the pending amendment to conference. However, I think we are getting into a very dangerous legislative situation when the legislative arm of the Government, contrary to the best judgment of either the Veterans' Administration or the military authorities, tells those agencies that they must keep certain hospitals open, despite the fact that the agencies have said that, in their judgment, the hospitals are not needed and that keeping them open would not be justified, in view of the fact that the number of patients is so much less than it was during the Korean war and that other hospitals which are being operated can take care of the patient load without certain institutions being maintained. It seems to me we are encroaching on the field of the executive branch of Government when we write such a mandatory provision into the bill.

I have jealously guarded, and shall continue to do so, regardless of whether the administration be Democratic or Republican, against encroachment by the executive branch on the legislative arm of the Government; and, for that same reason, we ought to be doubly careful about the legislative arm of Government encroaching on the executive arm, because Congress charges that branch of Government with the responsibilities of administration.

I do not want to see closed any institution which it is necessary and proper to keep open, and which is needed in order to take care of either veteran patients or military patients; but I think it should be closed, when, in the best judgment of the military authorities, it should not be maintained, and we would be getting out of our field to insist that it should remain open.

In view of the action of the chairman of the committee, I hope, when the bill reaches conference, the conferees on the part of the Senate and the House will very carefully go over both amendments, and, if necessary, obtain additional information from the Veterans' Administration and from the Department of Defense, and ascertain whether in fact it is wise to maintain the hospitals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to say briefly that what the distinguished minority leader has said is generally true; but the situation is that it has been determined to close the hospitals, not operate them, and declare them—at least the one at Hot Springs, Ark.—surplus to the needs of the Government. The amendment would require the hospital to be kept open and operating only during the next fiscal year, during which time it is expected that a complete survey will be made of the hospital facilities belonging to the Government, in an effort to ascertain whether there is a need for the hospitals and whether they should be continued or abandoned.

I may say that both the House and the Senate committees have said in their committee reports that it was the sense of the committees that the hospitals should be operated for the next year. The amendment would simply write into the pending bill a statement showing the sense of the House and Senate committees.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to call attention to the fact that the Hoover Commission has recommended the abandonment of quite a number of hospitals, particularly veterans hospitals, two of which are located in my State. It has been my assumption that the Congress should have the right to pass on the recommendations of the Hoover Commission in one form or another. Yet if Members of Congress have to offer amendments to the Defense Appropriation bill with reference to all the hospitals in which they are interested, an embarrassing situation would be created. It had not occurred to me it would be necessary to offer an amendment to the bill in order to assure that hospitals in Kentucky, which it had been recommended be closed, could remain open. I am very much against the closing down of the hospitals, but if references to hospitals all over the country recommended for abandonment by the Hoover Commission have to be put in the bill by amendment, that certainly creates a strange situation.

I should like to inquire as to what opportunity we shall have to see to it that there remain open other hospitals which are recommended for abandonment in the future.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As the Senator knows, the Hoover Commission recommendations have no force or effect until the executive branch or the Congress implements them.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The pending amendment is directed against action proposed to be taken prior to any recommendation by the Hoover Commission. Until the veterans hospitals located in the State of the Senator from Kentucky are placed in jeopardy by some action which would close them, rather than there being merely a recommendation by a commission that they be closed, I should not think it would be necessary to place a mandate in the pending bill that the hospitals remain open.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it my understanding that the hospitals involved in the amendments are already on their way out because of executive action?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Regardless of recommendations of the Hoover Commission?

Mr. McCLELLAN. They are not related to Hoover Commission recommendations in any way.

Mr. BARKLEY. They are in a different category from the ones I have mentioned. Is that correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. They are in a completely different category.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I should like to ask unanimous consent that I may join the Senator from Arkansas in sponsoring the amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am very happy to have the Senator from Massachusetts join in sponsoring it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Does the Senator from Arkansas yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], on behalf of himself and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I call up the amendment which I have at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 52, beginning in line 7, it is proposed to strike out all of section 638, as follows:

SEC. 638. No part of the funds appropriated in this act may be used for the disposal or transfer by contract or otherwise of work that has been for a period of 25 years or more performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense unless certified by the Secretary of Defense and reported by him to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives at least 60 days in advance that the disposal is economically sound and that the related services can be performed by a contractor without danger to national security.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the meaning of this amendment should be clear to all Members of the Senate, because we have been discussing it among ourselves and it has been discussed widely in the press.

This is the section by means of which the House of Representatives in the first instance endeavored to slow down, if not entirely stop, the present efforts of the administration and of various departments of the Government to divest the Government of socialistic enterprises in which the Government should not be engaged, and which can most logically and properly be handled by private enterprise.

In the committee we tried to add certain corrective language to the amendment. I submitted language which I thought would correct it. The language I proposed called for the elimination of such practices, going back for a period of 25 years. But I now find—and let me say that the Democratic Members specially will be interested in this—that not all the confusion in the Government, in terms of invading the field of private industry, occurred during the days of the New Deal and the Fair Deal; but a great deal of it occurred before 1933.

So I now think it is best for us to eliminate the entire section, and to give the conference committee an opportunity to consider the whole broad vista of socialistic activities on the part of the Federal Government. Then, if the House of Representatives will not agree to eliminate all the language, it will at least be possible for the House and the Senate to agree on writing strong corrective language.

In short, Mr. President, my proposal is that, by means of the language we adopt, we make it possible for all socialistic enterprises to be eliminated from the Government; and my amendment will make it possible for such governmental activities to be scrutinized and abandoned not only in the case of governmental operations during the days of the New Deal and the Fair Deal, but also in the case of governmental operations in prior periods, and even going back to and before the period of World War I. I am, of course, happy that the Appropriations Committee adopted the language I offered in committee strengthening our stand against socialism. However, I feel my present amendment is necessary to complete the job and to make our stand against useless socialistic ventures completely clear.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I believe this amendment is a very timely one. The Select Committee on Small Business held extensive and intensive hearings on this question, in an effort to locate the various types of governmental operations in fields which can well be served by private enterprise. It was shocking to us to find that the Government is engaged in a great many types of business activity.

As the Senator from South Dakota has just stated, the committee endeavored to study this phase of governmental operations, going back for a period of 40 years—back, in fact, beyond the time of World War I, inasmuch as many of these activities came into existence as governmental functions during World War I, as well as thereafter.

Mr. President, if the amendment of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota is agreed to, I believe that in conference the whole question will be wide open. If that happens, then, if

there is merit to the proposal to add certain language which will safeguard various of the military or naval installations of the Government, there will be opportunity to include such language in the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. In that event, the entire subject will be before the conferees; and if certain language should be included, in order to provide a safeguard, it will be possible to add such language to the bill.

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. Whereas the present language would not make it possible to remove the Government from all the intrusions into the field of private enterprise which occurred during World War I, well beyond the purview of the present act, and it would slow down and perhaps stop other moves to get our Government out of socialistic projects.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Dakota will yield to me——

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota a question. Was it not the Senator from South Dakota who suggested the language which now appears at this point in the bill? Did not the committee accept the language he proposed?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. I did so, as I have said, in error; in fact, I have now confessed publicly the sin I committed in that respect. I proposed that language because I was under the misapprehension that most of these intrusions into the field of private enterprise occurred subsequent to 1933. However, I have pointed out that I now find that many of them occurred before 1933. Certainly we should be diligent in removing the Government from the field of private business, regardless of whether such Government intrusions into private business occurred during Democratic administrations or at other times.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is true. However, I should point out that the Senator from South Dakota was so persuasive upon a majority of the members of the committee, including all the Democratic members, that he convinced the committee that the language he proposed to add to the bill would take the Government out of socialistic enterprises generally.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. But upon further examining into the matter, I have found that some of the Republican administrations were also guilty of engaging in certain socialistic activities. So I should like to have the language at this point in the bill made all-embrasive, so that all socialistic enterprises of the Government will be included, when we act to take the Government out of private business.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to agree with the new proposal the Senator from South Dakota is making.

On the other hand, another member of the committee, who is not Socialist, either, thinks that the language first proposed by the Senator from South Dakota will be so effective in removing socialistic influences from the Government, that that language should be included at this time.

So, Mr. President, I wish that the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] would get together, in order that appropriate language may be drafted.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In connection with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, I wish to say that in the committee, the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota was agreed to, and no member of the committee voted against it; all the committee members thought the amendment was stated properly.

Furthermore, on June 17, the United States Chamber of Commerce, which all along has been sponsoring this fight, and had been misrepresenting the effect of this section, said:

> Although the Senate's version of section 638 is less restrictive, it still would have the effect of blocking specific cutbacks and slowing down the entire program.

That was the position taken by the United States Chamber of Commerce, after its last look at this provision of the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. But I have already said that this language was drawn up hastily in the committee.

My understanding then was that most of the governmental intrusions into the field of private business had occurred during two recent Democratic administrations, which, to put the matter mildly, had leaned in the direction of a glorified central Government. However, I have since found that some similar steps were taken during World War I, and that some occurred even before then.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it not a fact that in the committee this matter was widely discussed, and there was considerable sentiment that the entire section should be deleted and, in that way, the matter should be thrown into conference?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it not also correct that the only difficulty was that there did not happen to be quite enough members of the committee who had that point of view; so when the decision to retain some language of this sort was made, it was then that the Senator from South Dakota and other committee members offered various suggestions in an effort at least to soften the provision which came to us from the other body. But in the committee there was considerable sentiment to the effect that the correct procedure would be to delete this section entirely. Is not that true?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield further to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad to yield further to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in the committee this question was debated at length. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] endeavored to correct what all of us recognize to be an abuse in the case of operations by the Federal Government in the field of private enterprise.

When the question arose, I offered an amendment calling for an extension for 40 years. I did so because I was chairman of the Small Business Committee when it conducted extensive hearings, in connection with which representatives of various governmental agencies, including the Department of Defense, appeared. In that hearings we discovered that one after another of the defense agencies were engaged in various types of enterprise which could well be handled by private businesses.

I felt that, if we went back 40 years, we would include the era when some of these governmental activities came into being, but that we would not go back so far that in any manner we would disrupt necessary defense functions in connection, for instance, with naval operations, concerning which it might be found that, because of necessary research activities or because of other important defense operations, it would not be possible to transfer to private enterprise all details of the functions or operations.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct. Were it not for that fact, I would try to contrive, on the floor of the Senate, language which would adequately safeguard the legitimate needs of defense and security, and still eliminate unnecessary socialistic enterprises. We can do this in conference much better by adopting my amendment striking out the entire paragraph and putting the entire situation in conference, where we can have the benefit of consultation with representatives of the Defense Department, and arrive at what I hope will be optimum light on the subject. That can be done better in conference than upon the floor of the Senate during debate.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. In a moment.

Let me point out the type of activity which the great Senate of the United States would be discouraging the Department of Defense and other departments from vacating if we left this language in. Before this language was written in the House and before the brakes were applied the Departments had started on a program of divesting themselves of unnecessary Government operations. Here are some of the things which have already been done:

We have gotten rid of two aluminum sweating activities; 7 scrap metal baling operations; 7 bakeries; 9 laundries; 1 caustic soda manufacturing activity—as I understand, that is a sodapop factory. They have eliminated one chlorine manufacturing activity, 4 ice plants, 1 acetylene manufacturing activity, 10 automotive repair shops, 4 cement mixing plants, 16 office equipment repair shops, 1 tire retreading activity, and 2 tree and garden nurseries.

They have eliminated coffee-roasting plants which have been operated as ventures in socialism, one of them being 100 years old. They have eliminated a rope manufacturing activity. They have

stopped using bureaucrats to engage in sawmill and logging operations in the South and elsewhere. They have eliminated a chain manufacturing activity. They are now buying chains manufactured by private enterprise.

I do not think the Congress wishes to go on record as saying, "Whoa! Do not go so fast. Do not get out of the socialistic enterprises so fast." So by striking out this language, we will enable the conference committee, headed by the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to sit down and write the kind of language needed to protect defense and security, but also to protect private enterprise.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MUNDT. I promised to yield first to the Senator from Pennsylvania. Then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I had intended to ask the distinguished Senator from South Dakota to enumerate some of the activities in which the National Defense Department is now engaging in competition with private enterprise.

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to do so.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. The Senator has very well illustrated the situation.

Mr. President, I have been in military work all my life. In one of the camps which I commanded, the laundry broke down. I recommended to the War Department at that time that the laundry be not rebuilt, that we could get the work done much more economically, and better, through private enterprise. That was the result.

I wished to ask the Senator from South Dakota to enumerate a number of activities in which the armed services are now engaged, which are absolutely in competition with private enterprise. The Senator has already given a number of illustrations to show that the Defense Department is engaged in many activities in which it has no business to engage, and which could be more economically conducted by private enterprise, to the advantage of the services.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator. I shall be happy to mention some of the activities now being studied at the direction of the President, and with the guidance of the Bureau of the Budget, looking to the possibility of the Departments divesting themselves of further enterprises. The ones I have mentioned have already been taken out of the area of socialism.

At the present time, the Government is operating fabricated textile product mills. Our friends from the South should be interested in that. I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is interested, because he represents a textile manufacturing area. Here we find the Government of the United States in the textile business.

The President of the United States has raised the question, and the Bureau of the Budget has said that the subject should be investigated. If it is found that the Government can get out of certain activities, it seems to me that the Congress ought not to try to stop the process.

The Government is in the millwork business; prefabricated wooden buildings and structural members; and the manufacture of wooden containers, except cigar boxes.

The Government is manufacturing mirror frames and picture frames. The great Government of the United States is hiring bureaucrats to manufacture mirror frames and picture frames, further running the Government into the red and increasing the burden of taxation, because invariably these socialistic enterprises lose money.

The Government is engaged in the manufacture of upholstered wooden household furniture. In order to show that the Government is completely nondiscriminatory, it also is engaged in the manufacture of metal household furniture. What is the matter with furniture manufactured in Arkansas, North Carolina, or in Grand Rapids, Mich? Why must the Government be manufacturing furniture? The Congress does not want to have written into the bill a provision that before the Government gets out of a certain activity there must be a report to Congress, and the subject must be studied for 60 days in an effort to divest the Government of Federal enterprises.

The Government is manufacturing mattresses and bed springs. It is manufacturing wood office furniture and metal office furniture. It is manufacturing window and door screens, weather stripping, and venetian blinds. There is page after page of this material. I submit that at this juncture the Congress does not wish to take a stand which would discourage an effort on the part of bureaucrats to divest themselves of socialistic enterprises.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator explain what is the need for writing into the bill any section comparable to section 638? So far as I know, there is no objection to the Government withdrawing from these enterprises, and there is no substantial sentiment in favor of discouraging the Government from doing so. Why is any provision of this sort needed in the bill at all?

Mr. MUNDT. The question asked by the Senator is answered by the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota, which would strike out the entire section, which was inserted in the House.

Mr. LONG. The Senator was suggesting that in conference some suitable language could be written. I see no need for any provision of this sort being in the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] raised the question in committee. There are certain legitimate Government activities, such as Navy Yard activities and others of which the Government should not be divested.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, in order that I may answer the question of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The United States Chamber of Commerce has been sponsoring this effort. I read from a statement by the chamber which was published last week:

> Although more moderate than as passed by the House, the rewritten section is contrary to a philosophy supported by private business, in efforts to reduce the number of commercial- and industrial-type facilities within the Department of Defense. The Hoover Commission recently declared such facilities "probably exceed 2,500," with a total investment of Government capital probably exceeding $15 million.

That includes every shipyard and every activity of the Department of Defense.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. My recollection has been that every time an effort was made to close down a $10,000 aluminum sweating plant, it required aggressive investigation and action before the Appropriations Committee to get any results in connection with such a minor item.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG. Why do we need anything further to encourage the services to retain these unnecessary operations? I feel that anything that is really needed by the Government would be retained. I see no indication that any activity really needed by the Government is to be closed.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree with the Senator. We should go as far as we can today in the Senate by striking out the section entirely, and sending it to conference.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think we can carry out the purposes of the Senator from South Dakota and the purposes of the Senator from Virginia. There is no question that the committee was against the idea of the Government engaging in business in competition with private enterprise. There is no question that the committee wanted the Government to get out of such businesses. But if we agree to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota, there will be a conference. I trust the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]; I trust the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]; I trust other members of the committee, including the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who will be conferees. Why can we not adopt the committee amendment and dispose of the bill?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me in order to permit me to answer that question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me conclude.

Mr. President, I should like to do what the Senator from Virginia wishes to do. I should like to do what the Senator from South Dakota wishes to do. I want to do what the committee would like to do. I shall be at the head of the conference committee, and as such, I shall depend on the other conferees on the part of the

Senate; and we will do what is right. That is why I cannot accept the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia trusts the Senator from New Mexico absolutely. He trusts the other conferees. However, if the Senate should strike out this provision, it would tie the hands of the conferees. They would not have anything to adjust. The language at the present time does not put any restraint upon the Department of Defense, or give power to any man to close down any establishment, or anything like that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. First of all, I wish to say I believe the Senator's amendment is a good one. It is proper in this situation to proceed by conference with the House. I certainly believe that we should try to get the Government out of competition with private business. There is no intention on the part of the administration or anyone else that I know of to get the Government to withdraw from legitimate defense activities, such as those in the Navy yards, where the Government builds warships, for example. That is the situation, notwithstanding any statements to the contrary.

I should like to ask the Senator to yield to me long enough so that I may request the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, how much time has been used on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has used 27 minutes. No time has been used in opposition.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be glad to work out an arrangement with regard to the time. How much time does the Senator from Texas wish to use on the other side?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has the floor. All this time is running against him.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from South Dakota does not consider the Federal operation of the Navy ordnance plants or similar activities, for example, as being a socialistic undertaking, does he?

Mr. MUNDT. I certainly do not, any more than I consider the operation of the Marine Corps or the Air Force or the REA as a socialistic undertaking. No one has suggested that we put the navy yards under private enterprise operation. Furthermore no one has suggested that we put the Marine Corps or the Air Force or the Army or the REA into private enterprise.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to congratulate the Senator from South Dakota on his presentation of his amendment. I should also like to congratulate the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. Furthermore, I wish to associate myself completely with the presentation made by the Senator from Minnesota as well as the one made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I believe it is a very sound amendment, and I hope the Senate will adopt it with a resounding vote.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Connecticut. Although I was in hope that the committee would accept it without a yea-and-nay vote, I rather welcome a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment. It will be the first time in a long period that the Senate will have had an opportunity to vote on the subject of socialism. It is pretty clear that we will either vote to give a free hand to our Government, which has been all too reluctant in divesting itself from socialism, or we will say to our Government, "You cannot get out of private enterprise undertakings, and you cannot move in that direction, because Congress may not let you do it."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from South Dakota to the fact that the yeas and nays have been ordered on his amendment. If he will yield back all time except 15 minutes, I will yield back all time in opposition to the amendment except 15 minutes. That would give us 30 minutes in which to discuss the amendment. In that way, notice could be served on all Members of the Senate that shortly after 5 o'clock there would be a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. If it is provided that I need not use my 15 minutes immediately, I have no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is agreeable. I yield back all my time except 15 minutes, on condition that the Senator from South Dakota do likewise.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield back all my time except 15 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 12 minutes to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I regret very much that the last recorded vote on the floor appeared to be a partisan vote. I do not think the security of our Nation is a partisan issue. Certainly the pending amendment is not a partisan amendment. It was reported by the House committee by a unanimous vote.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes to me, since I may go to an importance conference?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to support the position of the committee in this matter. The language was very thoughtfully worked out. Let me state briefly what the provisions would do. It would allow the Secretary of Defense to abolish any industry carried on by Government which has not been in existence for 25 years. In connection with any industry in existence for more than 25 years the Secretary of Defense would have to report to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House at least 60 days before taking any action to dispose of such an industry. If any member of those committees should object, the Secretary would have to go into the matter very carefully with the members of the committee before proceeding.

I debated the subject in committee with my distinguished friend the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I believe the language which we finally adopted is fair language in the light of the position taken by the Senator from South Dakota and the position taken by the Senator from Virginia. In the case of any industry which has been conducted by the Government for more than 25 years it gives an opportunity for the Appropriations Committees of Congress to have a second look at the matter. I believe we should support the position of the committee, which was worked out after a good deal of debate.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I appreciate the fine statement of the Senator from Massachusetts. The Senator from Massachusetts and I served on the subcommittee which framed the first language, which we thought was an improvement on the House language. In the full committee we yielded to the suggestion of the Senator from South Dakota.

As the Senator from Massachusetts has stated, this is nothing but a proper safeguard against a reckless program of destroying every activity of Government however essential it may be. The first report of the United States Chamber of Commerce stated, that under the House provision, Congress would have to act. That was not correct. In the second report, as I have already called to the attention of the Senate, it gave the impression that the Hoover Commission recommended that 2,500 agencies should be discontinued. That was not correct. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement on the Hoover Commission report.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Hoover Commission Report of Business Enterprises issued last month is a document of 113 pages including 42 dealing with the Department of Defense.

In the preface the report pointed out that the Government creates business-type enterprises in economic emergencies, in the emergencies of war and for the development of projects which are not adapted to private enterprise because of their nature and magnitude and that a very large portion of existing Government business enterprises originated in World War I, the depression, and World War II.

As an example of the tenacity with which some of these operations cling to existence it cited the Inland Waterways Corporation, established during World War I which survived for 33 years and lost money practically every year.

The report said the Government is conducting a multitude of projects in competition with and to the injury of the very system upon which our future security and prosperity is based but it commended the Department of Defense for reviewing its activities and making a start toward getting rid of those in competition with private enterprise. It said that 97 facilities in 20 categories, elimination of which were recom-

mended by the report have been discontinued or are scheduled for discontinuance by the Department of Defense.

Discussing the magnitude of the problem of dealing with commercial and industrial type facilities within the Department of Defense, the Commission report said it is impossible to estimate accurately but the total of such activities probably exceeds 2,500 in which the Government has a capital investment in excess of $15 billion.

It listed 47 categories of such activities known to exist as of December 31, 1954, but said not all of these are competitive with private enterprise and some are essential parts of the military service. The report said continuation of some activities is justified by the military on grounds of inability of private enterprise to provide service, geographic isolation, mobilization needs, classified nature of military requirements, hazardous nature of manufacture, training of personnel, need for research facilities and maintenance of morale through fringe benefits for personnel. The Commission concluded, however, on the basis of its study that probably 1,000 of the 2,500 individual facilities could be eliminated without injury to our national defense or any essential Government function.

Since this Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government admits in its report that it may be advisable for the Department of Defense to continue, for valid reasons of national interest approximately 3 out of 5 of the industrial and commercial type enterprises carried on by the Department of Defense, is it not reasonable that the Department be asked, as is proposed in our amended version of section 638, that advance notice be given to the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate as to which activities the Department proposes to discontinue? We can then express agreement or disagreement but have no authority to forbid or block the proposed action.

The Commission report also indicates the justification for some such advance notice and review in a chapter on readjustment and dislocation problems in which it points out that many loyal Federal employees will lose their jobs when industrial and commercial activities are discontinued and some communities will suffer economic hardship. The report cites with approval the handling of the closing of the Ropewalk in the Boston Navy Shipyard, which was announced more than 6 months before the effective date. It recommends that when governmental business activities are curtailed or terminated "every effort be made to proceed on a reasonable time schedule; to provide reasonable advance notice of contemplated action to the employees and communities concerned at the earliest possible opportunity; to assist dismissed employees in securing other employment and to insure that in scheduling terminations and in deciding which specific operations should be retained, if any (either by direct Government operation or by management contracts), consideration be given to the economic ability of the communities involved to stand the loss of Government payroll."

Section 638, as approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee, therefore, is not in conflict with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, as many businessmen have been led to believe, but would merely back up this recommendation which is numbered 22 in the report.

When we examine the recommendations of the Hoover Commission with regard to specific activities of the Department of Defense, we find that they do not call for blanket abandonment of activities which have been carried on by the Department over long periods of time which are of an industrial or commercial nature but that the Commission advocates selective action.

In Air Transport the report recommends elimination of duplications and merging the entire operation of the several branches of the service into one Military Air Transport Service which would be restricted and realistically limited to persons and cargo necessary for military purposes, and it suggests that commercial carriers be utilized to the maximum practical extent.

Similarly for Sea Transport, the Commission recommends greater use of private vessels to reduce the Military Sea Transport nucleus fleet, but both air and sea transport services operated by the Department of Defense would be continued.

The recommendation as to shipyards is that Congress should appoint a Commission to study the effect of Government construction and repair operations and that this commission should make recommendations where advisable for more use of private facilities and disposition of Government facilities.

It would seem most appropriate, therefore, that the Department of Defense should be required to notify the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate if it proposes to close down or curtail the activities of any Government shipyard before this recommended study has been made.

The chapter of the report dealing with Federal industrial facilities says that 288 large establishments of this type, mostly held over from World War II constitute the National Military Industrial Reserve, but that 148 other plants already have been disposed of on conditions that protect the military interest.

Of the plants still held, the report says: "Some of these plants are competitive with private enterprise; some could be made to contribute to the private enterprise system; some are essential to defense; some must be retained for standby."

It recommends a review of these plants to see which ones might be sold, which should be retained as standby, and which operations might be handled on a contract basis.

On the subject of commissary stores and post exchanges the report recommends that they be confined to localities where local facilities are not available or adequate; that prices be fixed to cover all costs; that use be limited to military personnel except in isolated or overseas locations and that consideration be given to contracting out their operation.

In the field of food and clothing, the commission report criticizes baking, coffee roasting, meat cutting, clothing manufacturing, laundering, and dry-cleaning establishments which not only are in direct competition with private enterprise but which in many instances have been operated at less than their capacity while private establishments in the same localities had ample excess capacity which could have been used. It challenges Defense Department arguments as to the need for these and recommends that all of these establishments except those located in isolated or overseas areas be closed and the equipment, except that necessary for a mobilization reserve, be disposed of to the best advantage of the Government.

Discussing dental and medical manufacturing and repair facilities the report recommends that they be discontinued except where needed for training purpose, mobilization reserve or where they are in remote areas.

All of these recommendations taken together, which the report says would result in return of large amounts of invested capital, economies in Government expenditures, increase of tax revenues, and creation of a more healthy economic system, would involve, however, as I have previously indicated, only about 1,000 of around 2,500 commercial and industrial-type facilities now in operation.

The selection of which operations to close and which to continue will involve in every case questions of judgment and I find it difficult to understand the reluctance of businessmen to allow the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate to at least have advance notice and an opportunity to express their opinion about these decisions, where the operation has been conducted for 25 years or more.

I am convinced that members of these committees, as now constituted, are devoted to the principles of individual free enterprise and would not attempt to block any effort to get the Defense Department out of business except where an action obviously was hasty, ill-advised and against the real interest of our national defense.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The report stated that there were possibly a thousand activities which could be discontinued without any serious interruption of or detriment to the public business, but that the other 1,500 should be carefully investigated. It stated further that many of them were so essential that the Government would have to carry them on. That is what the Hoover Commission stated.

As I previously indicated, this is not a partisan issue. So far as I can tell, both Democrats and Republicans on the House Appropriations Committee supported the proposal. A Democrat on the floor of the House made the motion to delete it from the bill, and that motion was defeated by a large majority. Then in our subcommittee, all of us, Democrats and Republicans alike, supported the amendment which was adopted. In the full committee all of us supported it, both Democrats and Republicans. We did so because, in view of the known drive to take Government out of certain activities in which it has been engaged—2,500 activities involving an investment of $15 billion—we felt that before that was done, the Committees on Appropriations should have a 60-day period in which to determine whether an activity should be discontinued. The committees could not veto anything. But when the Secretary of Defense says, "Here is an activity I want to end, and this is the reason why I want to end it, and here is why it will not hurt our national defense effort," the committees would merely have an opportunity to analyze the proposal and to say, if they approved it, "Very well, you can do it."

I assume that in nine-tenths of the cases we would say that. Mind you, Mr. President, these are not activities which started since World War II. The amendment has reference only to those which have been in operation for 25 years or more. If they have been operated that long, a proposal to discontinue would be reported to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate. As the chairman of the subcommittee has said, we are just as dedicated to the principle of private enterprise as is any member of the United States Chamber of Commerce, but we think the people are entitled to the deliberate majority judgment of their duly elected Senators and Representatives as to whether the Government is to be taken out of business in connection with some essential operation which it has traditionally carried on. The chamber of commerce desires to leave the decision with a member of

the Cabinet who has not been elected. All of the activities in question are in the Department of Defense.

I am not making any criticism of any Cabinet officer, but I would say that it is only fair to our respective States that we reserve the right to be informed just as the Armed Services Committee did in the case of proposed land acquisitions for all military agencies. They cannot buy land. They have the money, but they have to justify the need. That question would come before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Do I correctly understand that if section 638 is deleted from the bill it would mean that the Department could indiscriminately cease its activities which have been going on for 25 years or more?

Mr ROBERTSON. It certainly could. The United States Chamber of Commerce apparently wishes to close them all. They say that is the private-enterprise way, the American way. I am just as much in favor of private enterprise as is the chamber of commerce, but I cannot endorse that position.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I merely wish to associate myself with everything the distinguished Senator from Virginia has said. I realize that if the Defense Department were indiscriminately to cease the activities in which it has been engaged for more than 25 years, a great many communities would be dislocated, and it would cost more to do the job than it does at the present time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There would be ghost towns all over the United States if we put the Government out of business in connection with those activities. The Hoover Commission says that the cases must be very carefully studied because of the impact on given communities. Such questions must be considered. Under the present pressure without such a provision in the law the Secretary of Defense and other Cabinet officers who are in charge of such operations would be given a free hand to do whatever they pleased without saying to anyone, "By your leave."

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is it not a fact that the committee amendment is a very mild one? In the first place, it concerns activities which have been carried on by the Government for 25 years, and the discontinuance of which would not affect national security. That is a very minimum requirement on the part of the Appropriations Committee with relation to action which might affect employment rights and communities which may be dependent upon such Government activities for their survival. For Congress merely to ask for a report along those lines is the very least we can accept.

Mr. ROBERTSON. If Senators would only read the report filed by the Hoover Commission they would find it lists the businesses involved, such as coffee roasting, dry cleaning, lumber plants, paint plants, and so forth. They are in that general category. I agree with the Hoover Commission 100 percent. I do not want the Government to be in any business unnecessarily. I do not wish the Government to do anything which private enterprise can do just as well and often more cheaply. But there are other activities which the Hoover Commission has said are very essential and which should be considered. I do not propose to vote to make a ghost town out of Portsmouth, Va., where 15,000 or 17,000 out of 50,000 persons are dependent upon their jobs in the shipyards.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, quotations from the Washington Report, a weekly newspaper of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

There being no objection, the quotations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The weekly newspaper of the United States Chamber of Commerce, Washington Report, dated July 7, 1955, had a leading article headlined "Defense Department Decompetition Effort Faces Serious Check—Senate Appropriations Committee Retains Proposal Retarding Cutback of Activities."

This article said, "A serious potential check on the Defense Department's program to eliminate business and industrial-type activities which compete unfairly with private business was voted this week by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

"In acting upon the House-passed Defense appropriation bill (H. R. 6042), the committee retained in modified form a provision which would retard the Defense Department in its efforts to terminate such activities.

"As approved by the House, this provision (sec. 638) would, in effect, have required congressional committee approval of any decompetition projects.

"The Senate committee revised the language to require the Secretary of Defense to report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, 60 days in advance, any proposals to curtail operations which have been carried on for 25 years.

"Although the Senate's version of section 638 is less restrictive, it still would have the effect of blocking specific cutbacks and slowing down the entire program.

Retention of the section was voted by the Senate Committee despite strong representations by the national chamber, trade associations, other organizations, and individual businessmen."

The article also said that "although more moderate than as passed by the House, the rewritten section is contrary to a philosophy supported by private business in efforts to reduce the number of commercial and industrial-type facilities within the Department of Defense. The Hoover Commission recently declared such facilities 'probably exceed 2,500' with a total investment of Government capital probably exceeding $15 billion."

Legislative Daily news release distributed by the United States Chamber of Commerce under date of Tuesday, June 14, said that as approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee the Defense appropriations bill "retains a controversial provision which would require the Defense Department to obtain permission from Congress before disposing of any business-type activity it has been carrying on."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia need have no fear concerning Norfolk or Portsmouth, Va., where there are military or naval installations, because there is no intention, I am sure, on the part of any of us to disrupt those installations. It was suggested that we go back to the era of World War I and World War II. According to testimony adduced in committee hearings, the reason why the work was being conducted by the Government was that there were many secret installations on vessels, and so forth, with which the general public was not acquainted——

Mr. ROBERTSON. In committee I said we should go back 40 years, but there were others who thought differently.

Mr. THYE. I agreed, with reservations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I honestly and sincerely feel that we have gone about as far as we can go in connection with section 638, without eliminating it completely from the bill, and causing a situation whereby the Secretary of Defense could indiscriminately cease these activities. I do not think it is a question between socialism and free enterprise. Whatever we have today we have built up through a slow process.

If we indiscriminately cease these activities we are going to affect many innocent workers who have established their homes in the localities involved. If we are going to do it at all we must do it slowly and carefully and with a sense of responsibility, taking into account the economic effect on many innocent workers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I would say to the Senator from Minnesota that there are plans to close down Government activities which have been in existence for a long period of time. We are now engaged in a struggle to preserve the ropewalk at the Boston Navy Yard which has been in operation since 1805. I think there is a definite danger that some projects which have been traditional may be put out of business. I think we have a right to expect a report to the Appropriations Committee that the closing of any such activity is feasible, sound, economical, and is in accordance with the preservation of the national defense.

That is all the amendment provides. It does not seem to me to be excessive. We do not even have the right of veto over the closing of the plant. All we ask is that the Secretary make a report before he takes action. It seems to me that that would be in accordance with sound precedents and would be in keeping with the interests of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

The Senator from South Dakota has 15 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield back all of that time except 8 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. When the Senator from South Dakota has finished, I will suggest the absence of a quorum, in order to accommodate all Senators.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. In answer to the statement made by the junior Senator from Massachusetts about rope manufacturing, I feel quite certain that free enterprise could handle that work. However, there might be some historical reason for retaining it where it is, because if that business were taken away from that area it might cause some dislocation and great hardship by reason of unemployment. That is recognized. Therefore, it would be left to the Secretary of Defense to make an examination of the situation.

But I still contend that if we went back 40 years, and with the reservation that the Secretary of Defense might examine the question, we would then be on safe ground.

I will admit that the amendment contained in the bill as reported will bring the matter into conference; and the conferees, in their good judgment, might modify it.

But if there were a limitation of 25 years, and if we took the matter to conference with the House, and they differed with us, they might hold the time to 25 years. It was for that reason it was felt that 40 years would be safer than 25 years.

I agree that if the provision were struck out entirely, we would start with a clean slate on the Senate side, we could make compromises with the House conferees, and then come forth with a workable, sound bill.

I do not favor destroying activities which are recognized as being necessary to the national defense; but I recognize that many functions have been taken over as military operations which could be done as well by private enterprise, if not better. That is why I support the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. If I have a moment or two left, I will yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I promised to yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield a minute of my time to the senior Senator from Minnesota so that he may answer a question of the senior Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MUNDT. Very well. I yield another minute to the senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CHAVEZ. While it is true that both sides want to save private enterprise, how is it possible to do so unless the committee amendment shall be agreed to?

The difference between the committee amendment and the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota is that if the committee amendment shall be adopted, the question will still be in conference. What would be have to offer the House conferees if the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota were agreed to?

Mr. THYE. We would have all the colloquy which has taken place in the Senate this afternoon. Do not think for a moment that the House conferees will not be familiar with the colloquy. We would start out with nothing in the Senate bill. Then we would agree upon something, and all of us would be searching for additional information with which to go to conference.

I believe the Senator from South Dakota has offered a way out of the problem, by which we would allay the fear on the part of private enterprise of the Nation that Congress was soft toward those who want the Government to continue doing business in the field of free enterprise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 1 minute to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, very little can be said in 1 minute, but I wish to give the Senate the benefit of my own experience in commanding many military posts throughout the Nation. The amendment will in no way disturb the national defense. Personally, I think it will improve the national defense, because it has been my experience that very much better service is obtained from private enterprise than from installations which have been established as a part of the national defense organization. Many of the national defense installations have been in existence for more than a century. They do a magnificent job. Nevertheless, in a country which encourages competition, the best results will be obtained from free enterprise.

I sincerely hope the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota will prevail.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield myself the remainder of my time, which I believe is only 3 or 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MUNDT. I wish to reply first to the arguments made by the Senator from Virginia, because I found them to be very interesting and significant.

The first was his remark that the adoption of the amendment might cause the Navy yards in his State to go out of the business of legitimate defense production.

Under this authority, the Government cannot vacate any of the responsibilities it has assumed as a result of legislative mandate. The Government cannot divest itself of any business or activity into which Congress has placed it. My amendment means only that anything which the Government established by executive edict it can divest itself of by executive edict.

There is no more opportunity for the Government to take itself out of the field of operating Navy yards or gun-making or from the REA than there would be of it flying to the moon. To do so would require legislative power, not executive edict and Congress would never so vote.

I think really that the gist of the argument of the Senator from Virginia was his second point. He said that some ghost towns would be created in Virginia. He said that to take the Government out of business would put Government employees out of work.

If his argument were carried to its logical conclusion, it would mean that the Government could never fire anyone, and that the size of this bureaucracy could never be reduced.

But that is not true, because if the work which the Government is now doing is important, those same employees can be rehired by private enterprise to do the same work.

If that is not to be the case, how can the collecting of taxes in the United States be justified to maintain a socialistic enterprise which is so useless, that the only argument that can be made to defend it is that to eliminate it will put some Federal employees out of work?

They will not be thrown out of work if the work is essential, because the jobs will continue. Some private entrepreneur will pick up the work and will hire the same employees.

I sincerely hope that the Senate, on a yea-and-nay vote, will not say that it wants to discourage the Government from getting out of business, when the business is needless, and simply on the argument that getting out of the business will mean that some Government employee will temporarily be out of work.

If we intend to strive for economy, if we mean what we say in support of private enterprise, if we mean that we will try to get a little more efficiency in Government, certainly we do not want to apply the brakes when, at long last, the executive agencies are willing to shrink, instead of increase in size; when, at long last, we have them coming to Congress and saying, "We would like to get out of a few useless socialistic enterprises."

Certainly if the Senate wants to vacate those Government jobs by the proposed amendment, the amendment will increase the bargaining power of the Senate in conference with the House. It will provide a blank page against a resolution. The conferees can then provide every safeguard the Senator from Virginia might desire in his effort to protect the Navy yard at Portsmouth and the other necessary installations in Virginia, and to protect the national defense in general. But my amendment is our opportunity, at this session, to register ourselves in favor of a decrease in the size of Government business, and to eliminate the costs of Government, which are steadily mounting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is absent by leave of the Senate until June 21, 1955, on behalf of the Senate Appropriations Committee to conduct an on-the-spot study of specific matters relating to our foreign-aid program.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the United Nations anniversary celebration in San Francisco as a representative of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is unavoidably absent.

On this vote the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] has a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has a general pair with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER].

I also announce that if present and voting the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent on official business for the Committee on Appropriations.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the funeral of a friend.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS].

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] has a general pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—33

Allott	Curtis	Martin, Pa.
Barrett	Duff	McCarthy
Beall	Dworshak	Mundt
Bender	Goldwater	Schoeppel
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Smith, N. J.
Bricker	Hruska	Thye
Bush	Ives	Watkins
Butler	Knowland	Welker
Capehart	Long	Wiley
Carlson	Malone	Williams
Case, S. Dak.	Martin, Iowa	Young

NAYS—48

Aiken	Hill	Neely
Barkley	Holland	Neuberger
Bible	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Payne
Chavez	Kennedy	Purtell
Daniel	Kilgore	Robertson
Douglas	Kuchel	Russell
Ellender	Langer	Saltonstall
Ervin	Lehman	Scott
Flanders	Magnuson	Smathers
Frear	Mansfield	Smith, Maine
Fulbright	McClellan	Sparkman
Gore	McNamara	Stennis
Hayden	Monroney	Symington
Hennings	Morse	Thurmond

NOT VOTING—15

Anderson	Eastland	Jenner
Bridges	George	Kerr
Clements	Green	Millikin
Cotton	Humphrey	Murray
Dirksen	Jackson	Potter

So Mr. MUNDT's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, shall the bill pass.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back all time remaining under my control.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield back all time remaining under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is absent by leave of the Senate until June 21, 1955, on behalf of the Senate Appropriations Committee to conduct an on-the-spot study of specific matters relating to our foreign-aid program.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the United Nations anniversary celebration in San Francisco as representative of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is unavoidably absent.

On this vote, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] has a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has a general pair with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER].

I also announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote yea.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent on official business for the Committee on Appropriations.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate, to attend the funeral of a friend.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent by leave of the Senate, to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS].

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] has a general pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

If present and voting, the Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. COTTON], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would each vote "yea".

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—80

Aiken	Dworshak	Kuchel
Allott	Ellender	Langer
Barkley	Ervin	Lehman
Barrett	Flanders	Long
Beall	Frear	Magnuson
Bender	Fulbright	Malone
Bennett	Goldwater	Mansfield
Bible	Gore	Martin, Iowa
Bricker	Hayden	Martin, Pa.
Bush	Hennings	McCarthy
Butler	Hickenlooper	McClellan
Byrd	Hill	McNamara
Capehart	Holland	Monroney
Carlson	Hruska	Morse
Case, N. J.	Ives	Mundt
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Neuberger
Curtis	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Daniel	Kennedy	Pastore
Douglas	Kilgore	Payne
Duff	Knowland	Purtell

Robertson	Smith, N. J.	Watkins
Russell	Sparkman	Welker
Saltonstall	Stennis	Wiley
Scott	Symington	Williams
Smathers	Thurmond	Young
Smith, Maine	Thye	

NOT VOTING—16

Anderson	George	Millikin
Bridges	Green	Murray
Clements	Humphrey	Potter
Cotton	Jackson	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Jenner	
Eastland	Kerr	

So the bill (H. R. 6042) was passed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, first I wish to thank the Senators who have helped on this bill. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Office appointed Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HILL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. FLANDERS conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the vote just announced is a great tribute to the leadership of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. CHAVEZ]. As all Senators know, this is one of the most difficult appropriation bills to come before the Senate. It is the largest of the regular appropriation bills. There are always several controversies involved in it.

I take this opportunity not only to compliment the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, but the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, and all other members of the subcommittee.

I think the unanimous vote on this important bill is notice to the entire world that we intend to keep this country prepared and to keep it strong.

I express my personal appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee for the fine work he had done, to the excellent staff who worked with him, and to every member of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 41) to authorize the enrollment with certain changes of Senate Joint Resolution 62, dedicating the Lee Mansion in Arlington National Cemetery as a permanent memorial to Robert E. Lee.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) directing a study and report by the Secretary of Agriculture on burley tobacco marketing controls.

EMERGENCY LOANS FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 578, Senate bill 1582.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1582) to amend Public Law 727, 83d Congress, so as to extend the period for the making of emergency loans for agricultural purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "thereof", to strike out "1956" and insert "1957", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of the act entitled "An act to provide emergency credit," approved August 31, 1954 (Public Law 727, 83d Cong.), is amended by striking out "1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "1957."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, this bill, with the committee amendments, would extend for 2 years (until June 30, 1957) the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make emergency loans under Public Law 727, 83d Congress. That law provides for loans in areas where credit cannot be met for a temporary period from ordinary sources, and is due to expire at the end of this month. In some areas (listed in the committee report) there is a continuing need for these loans at this time, and it is advisable to have this authority available for those areas as well as for other areas in which it may become needed. This bill was approved unanimously by the Senate Agriculture Committee and also has been favorably reported from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not correct that this bill would take care of situations in counties where there has been some drought, and where there have been some adverse economic conditions, but possibly not of such a nature as to be classified as a disaster?

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that this situation affects the farmer of the entire Nation?

Mr. YOUNG. It does. This type of loan is extended in several counties in New Jersey and in many other counties in every area of the United States, including my own State of North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to ask whether the interest rate will be 5 percent, as announced by the Secretary of Agriculture, or 3 percent, the rate which is being discussed by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The rate of interest will be the same as has been fixed by law. The other day, I believe, the Senate passed a bill fixing the rate of interest on a certain type of disaster loan at 3 percent.

Mr. MONRONEY. Would this activity qualify for the 3-percent rate, or would the Secretary of Agriculture have the right to make the rate either 5 or 3 percent?

Mr. AIKEN. I think all interest rates are now fixed by law—assuming that the House agrees with the Senate that the rate of interest fixed on certain types of loans shall be 3 percent. I am sure that whatever the interest rate is on this type of loan, it is fixed by law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1582) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RESULTS OF PRICE-SUPPORT AND OTHER PROGRAMS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the Commodity Credit Corporation issued a report showing the losses and gains on the operations of the price-support program. It will be noted, from a study of this report, that the amount of CCC losses from October 17, 1933, to April 30, 1955—a period of nearly 22 years—on basic commodities, was $353,675,738, or an average of some $16,450,034 a year.

It will be further noted, as to cotton, that the price-support program for that commodity actually shows a gain—a profit—of $267,290,377, and that the losses sustained on price-support operations for the basic commodities, as a whole, accrued principally on corn and wheat.

I further invite the attention of Senators to the fact that the total losses on all price-support programs, which would include nonbasics, such as honey, milk, butter, cheese, wool, and so on, aggregate $2,093,579,569, or an average of roughly $97,371,143 a year. If we exclude the wartime consumer subsidies—which are patently not a part of our normal farm-price program—the losses on the entire price-support operations—for both basics and nonbasics—for the period beginning October 17, 1933, and ending April 30, 1955, were $1,868,268,619, or about $86,896,215 a year over a 22-year period.

Mr. President, these figures indicate that the losses incurred in our price-support programs are far from astronomical, as some opponents of our farm program would have us believe.

I am pleased, also, to note that this report does not attempt to bring together all farm programs, such as the REA, the Farmers' Home Administration, the Extension Service, agricultural research, and others, as was the case not long ago when the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had occasion to take testimony on our farm-price program. Senators may recall that the figures to which I refer elicited much comment in our Nation's press, which

used that official United States Department of Agriculture summary as the basis of a charge that the price-support program was costing our taxpayers billions upon billions of dollars a year.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to set the record straight and, in doing so, to use an official Department of Agriculture summary which does not include the cost of programs totally unrelated to price-support operations. I hope it will be noted that the annual average cost of this program is counted, not in billions a year, but in millions—and that the cost is a reasonable one for the result it has sought to achieve.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement indicating the authority for the price support and related programs, including the authority for the emergency feed program. I ask that this statement, together with the table to which I have just referred, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE—COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Analysis of program results from Oct. 17, 1933, through Apr. 30, 1955 [1] *(realized gains and losses)*

Program and commodity	Oct. 17, 1933, through June 30, 1941	July 1, 1941, through June 30, 1946	July 1, 1946, through June 30, 1951	Fiscal year ended June 30— 1952	1953	1954	Fiscal year 1955 through Apr. 30, 1955	Oct. 17, 1933, through Apr. 30, 1955
Price support program: [1]								
Basic commodities:								
Corn	*$20,078,488	*$14,336,569	*$17,752,683	$1,783,916	*$20,526,523	*$80,502,840	*$62,941,007	*$214,354,284
Cornmeal [2]							595	595
Cotton	*27,401,798	218,328,306	77,525,617	148,924	*381,572	*1,796,768	867,668	267,290,377
Cotton, export differential [3]		*27,651,360	*13,709,858					
Cotton, Puerto Rican		*126,011	*4,187					*130,198
Cotton, rubber barter		11,055,451						11,055,451
Peanuts			*81,002,197	*8,670,873	*2,975,881	*23,359,266	*2,093,641	*118,101,858
Rice			*1,238,923	57,271	*277,861	568,205	7,991,738	7,100,430
Tobacco	*2,107,589	7,074,300	449,706	*1,014,923	*2,759,676	*956,375	31,616	
Wheat	*6,199,460	*11,775,173	*50,544,259	*7,722,262	*18,886,296	*71,338,944	*99,612,745	*266,079,139
Wheat flour [2]							187,047	187,047
Total	*55,787,335	182,568,944	*86,276,784	*15,417,947	*45,807,809	*177,385,988	*155,568,819	*353,675,738
Designated nonbasic commodities:								
Honey			*875,969	107	4,924	8,812	*5,377	*867,503
Milk and butterfat:								
Butter			*48,328,304	41,571	*456,492	*34,794,713	*116,397,893	*199,935,831
Butter oil						*895,422	*17,716,674	*18,612,096
Cheese			*25,071,542	31,405	14,708	*12,659,476	*43,835,918	*81,520,823
Milk, dried			*56,774,048	*1,183,459	*4,798,735	*82,363,920	*82,848,852	*227,969,014
Milk, fluid							*31,340,280	*31,340,280
Whey							*397,841	*397,841
Potatoes, Irish [4]		*$25,197,222	*452,740,718	*85,459	*73,658	*17,884	3,963	*478,110,978
Tung oil			*77,750	*1,154	*451	*2,685	*41,125	*123,165
Wool	*$176	*15,834,163	*76,306,520	*86,610	*15,290	*452,501	*662,604	*93,357,864
Total	*176	*41,031,385	*660,174,851	*1,283,599	*5,324,994	*131,177,789	*293,242,601	*1,132,235,395
Other nonbasic commodities:								
Barley		*40,019	*5,021,516	*2,807,078	*2,195,112	*2,047,568	*8,077,690	*20,188,983
Beans, dry edible		*179,753	*12,622,408	*15,429,183	*6,777,410	*7,093,768	*4,297,280	*46,399,802
Castor beans		*171,224	31					*171,193
Cotton, American-Egyptian		*538,573	57,956	175,206	294,665	39,547	*31	28,770
Cottonseed and products			4,908,903	2,686,612	7,701,799	*20,300,070	*44,749,329	*49,752,085
Eggs [5]		*224,002	*155,864,008	*29,368,028	*4,256,139	92,364	*3,362	*189,623,175
Flax fiber			*397,113					*397,113
Flaxseed and linseed oil		*22,209	*60,079,116	*4,683,190	*1,422,997	*51,274,251	*20,075,205	*137,556,968
Fruit, dried		*109,489	*14,771,976	*855				*14,882,320
Grain sorghum		437,456	*36,739,539	31,638	874,126	*7,278,771	*24,696,696	*67,371,786
Grapefruit juice			*1,732,374					*1,732,374
Hemp and hemp fiber		*20,201,375	*1,256,002	*1,778				*21,459,155
Hops	*162,036	*792,164						*954,200
Naval stores	*4,435,579	5,997,861	*2,951,996	3,876	30,253	9,370	101,680	*1,244,535
Oats			*440,428	*738,889	*194,938	*4,185,553	*7,307,032	*12,866,840
Olive oil					*170	*168,362	*228,625	*397,157
Peas, dry edible		*3,012	*885,738	*655	*31			*889,436
Pecans		*3,751						*3,751
Rye	*4,575	60,751	*245,223	18,599	7,947	*68,967	*1,640,692	*1,872,160
Rye flour [2]							7,080	7,080
Seeds		*148,193	*137,982	*537,879	*4,050,655	*17,989,413	*4,182,865	*27,046,987
Soybeans			4,386,895	1,574	*24,893	*647,855	*4,139	3,711,582
Sugar, Puerto Rican and Virgin Island			23,830					23,830
Sugar beets			*16,517,269					*16,517,269
Sweet potatoes			*135,421					*135,421
Turkeys			11,070					11,070
Vegetables, canned		*6,888	18,830					11,942
Total	*4,602,190	*15,944,584	*300,390,594	*50,650,030	*10,013,555	*110,913,297	*115,154,186	*607,668,436
Total price support	*60,389,701	125,592,975	*1,046,842,229	*67,351,576	*61,146,358	*419,477,074	*563,965,606	[6] *2,093,579,569
Supply program: [1] [7]								
Cotton and linters		1,592,551	283,648					1,876,199
General commodities purchase [8]			184,688,553	*195,564	1,314,667	1,841,948	699,317	188,348,921
Grains and seeds		23,969,000	51,139,460	437,204	405,837	*233,880	*176,482	75,541,139
Oils (bulk)		29,937	872,186	6,020	9,194	*47,287	77,548	947,598
Processed and packaged commodities [9]			38,918,857	162,193	23,559	136,460	23,072	39,264,141
Sugar, Puerto Rican raw			36,590		9,439	13,702		59,731
Tobacco		4,179,335	588,749					4,768,084
Other		*3,120,517	*293,533					*3,414,050
Total supply program		26,650,306	276,234,510	409,853	1,762,696	1,710,943	623,455	307,391,763

[1] Allocation of losses and gains as between price-support program and supply program for the period prior to the fiscal year 1947 was made on the basis of an analysis completed in April 1949. Since accounting records maintained prior to July 1, 1946, did not provide for this segregation, it was necessary to analyze program results in detail and in some cases make an estimate of the distribution between price support and supply of the total operating result as shown by the accounting records. This analysis was based on all known factors concerning the operations with respect to each commodity.

[2] Acquired by exchange of price-support commodities.

[3] Includes export differential on owned or pooled cotton only. Differential on exporters' cotton included under "Commodity export program."

[4] Includes price-support loss of $2,829,639 on the 1943 and 1944 potato programs, which was formerly included under "General commodities purchase program."

[5] Includes price-support loss of $11,956,386 on the 1944 egg program, which was formerly included under "General commodities purchase program."

[6] Amounts recovered or to be recovered from appropriations authorized in certain acts of the Congress, as detailed on schedule 8a, are not reflected as losses.

[7] Portion of overall supply and foreign purchase program effective July 1, 1952.

[8] Includes gain of $178,697,602 carried as "Special reserve—General commodities purchase program" as of June 30, 1946, and transferred to income in May 1947. Also see footnotes 4 and 5.

[9] During the period July 1, 1946, through June 30, 1949, activity under this program was reported as "General supply program."

*Denotes loss.

Analysis of program results from Oct. 17, 1933, through Apr. 30, 1955 (realized gains and losses)—Continued

Program and commodity	Oct. 17, 1933, through June 30, 1941	July 1, 1941, through June 30, 1946	July 1, 1946, through June 30, 1951	Fiscal year ended June 30— 1952	1953	1954	Fiscal year 1955 through Apr. 30, 1955	Oct. 17, 1933, through Apr. 30, 1955
Foreign purchase program: [7] [10]								
Cotton		$5,439,464	$458,888	*$2,617				$5,895,735
Fats and oils		22,543,441	16,374,717	*2,550				38,915,608
Foodstuffs		4,620,232	1,053,486	9,770	*$2,616	$15,970	$5,956	5,702,798
Other		*274,627	45,509	53,378				*175,740
Total foreign purchase		32,328,510	17,932,600	57,981	*2,616	15,970	5,956	50,338,401
Emergency feed program:								
Corn						*16,451,228	*522,336	*16,973,564
Cottonseed meal						*17,593,792	75,977	*17,517,815
Oats						*3,933,092	*33,168	*3,966,260
Wheat						*3,354,725	*164,704	*3,519,429
Total emergency feed program						*41,332,837	*644,231	*41,977,068
Commodity export program:								
Cotton [11]		*7,098,694	*5,439,964	1,494				*12,537,164
Wheat		*1,209,445	*618			*26,087,494	*35,832,167	*63,129,724
Total commodity export		*8,308,139	*5,440,582	1,494		*26,087,494	*35,832,167	*75,666,888
Storage facilities program		*10,087,438	*441,539	*1,628,947	121,488	231,341	*78,417	*11,883,512
Accounts and notes receivable (chargeoffs)		11,134	*1,342,301	*196,247	*253,682	*572,211	*538,439	*2,891,746
Total (excluding wartime consumer subsidy costs) [12]	*$60,389,701	166,187,348	*759,899,541	*68,707,442	*59,518,472	*485,511,362	*600,429,449	*1,868,268,619
Wartime consumer subsidy program [13]		*2,130,581,589	28,253,347	266,423	74,623	*107,991	*92,535	*2,102,187,722
Grand total	*60,389,701	*1,964,394,241	*731,646,194	*68,441,019	*59,443,849	*485,619,353	*600,521,984	*3,970,456,341

[7] Portion of overall supply and foreign purchase program effective July 1, 1952.
[10] Insofar as possible, operating results have been retroactively classified to correspond with current budgetary programs. In some instances, the accounts maintained prior to July 1, 1946, did not make possible a precise segregation of the results of foreign procurement operations.
[11] Includes export differential on exporters' cotton only.
[12] Includes losses totaling $56,239,432 on price-support commodities disposed of in accordance with Public Laws 389 and 393, 80th Cong., i. e., transferred to foreign assistance outlets at a price equal to price of a quantity of wheat having caloric value. The Corporation was reimbursed for these losses by the Secretary of the Treasury.
[13] Subsidy losses on corn for alcohol, wheat for alcohol, and wheat for feed are included on an estimated basis. This program in process of liquidation since July 1, 1949. For detail of subsidy costs by commodities by fiscal year prior to that date, see report of financial condition and operations as of June 30, 1949.
* Denotes loss.

Authority for Price Support and Related Programs

In furtherance of the purpose of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 31) of reestablishing the purchasing power of farmers at parity level, early price-support programs were carried out by CCC under the authority contained in its Delaware charter. The Corporation carried out price-support programs under this authority, in conjunction with various specific statutory authorizations and directives, until it was incorporated as a Federal corporation by the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in 1948 (62 Stat. 1070).

By the act of August 24, 1935, as amended (sec. 32), (49 Stat. 750, 774), the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized to use funds equivalent to 30 percent of the customs receipts to encourage exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities and to reestablish farmers' purchasing power by making payments in connection with the normal production of any agricultural commodity for domestic consumption. Many programs carried out under this authority are so designed as to have price-support effect.

Section 302 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 43) authorized CCC to make loans on agricultural commodities, including dairy products, and directed CCC to make loans upon wheat, cotton, and corn at levels between 52 and 75 percent of parity. Section 359 (e) (55 Stat. 90) of the act, added April 3, 1941, required that loans be made available on peanuts at levels between 50 and 75 percent of parity. Section 303 of the act (52 Stat. 45) authorized the Secretary to make payments to producers of corn, wheat, cotton, rice, or tobacco for the purpose of providing a return to such producers as nearly equal to parity price as funds appropriated for the purpose permitted.

Section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (49 Stat. 1150, 52 Stat. 31), authorized the Secretary to carry out the purposes of the act, one of which is to reestablish farmers' purchasing power, by making payments or grants of other aid to producers. Section 12 (a) of that act (49 Stat. 1151, 53 Stat. 550) authorized the Secretary to use funds appropriated under the act for the expansion of domestic and foreign markets and for surplus removal or disposition.

The act of May 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 203) directed CCC to make loans to cooperators on the 1941 crops of rice, tobacco, cotton, corn, and wheat at 85 percent of parity. This act was amended (55 Stat. 860) to add peanuts to the list of commodities to be supported and to extend its applicability to the 1942 through 1946 crops.

Section 8 (a) of the Stabilization Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 767) directed CCC to make loans to cooperators at 90 percent of parity upon any crop of cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco and peanuts harvested after December 31, 1941, and before 2 years after the end of the war. (This period ended December 31, 1948.) The act of June 30, 1944 (58 Stat. 632) amended this section by increasing the rate on cotton harvested after December 31, 1943, to 92½ percent of parity and the act of October 3, 1948 (58 Stat. 765) further amended this section by increasing the rate on cotton to 95 percent of parity with respect to crops harvested after December 31, 1943, and planted prior to January 1, 1945.

The act of July 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 506) required that the support rate on fire-cured tobacco be 75 percent of the rate for burley tobacco and that the rate for dark air-cured and Virginia sun-cured tobacco be 66⅔ percent of the burley rate.

Sec. 4 of the act of July 1, 1941, the so-called Steagall amendment (55 Stat. 498) required the Secretary during the war emergency to support at not less than 85 percent of parity or comparable price those nonbasic commodities with respect to which he requested increased production. By the act of October 2, 1942 (56 Stat. 768) the minimum rate of support was increased to 90 percent of parity and such support was required to be continued for 2 years after the end of the war.

The subsidy aspects of certain price support programs which were carried out at processor levels during the war years were carried out pursuant to directives issued under Executive Orders 9250 of October 3, 1942, and 9328 of April 8, 1943, issued under the Stabilization Act of 1942 and the First War Powers Act of 1941.

The act of August 5, 1947 (61 Stat. 769), required Commodity Credit Corporation to support the price of wool until December 31, 1948, at the level at which wool was supported in 1946.

The Agricultural Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1247) required the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of the 1949 crops of the basic commodities at 90 percent of parity and to support until January 1, 1950, the price of Steagall commodities at not less than 60 percent of parity or comparable price and not in excess of the level at which such commodities were supported in 1948, with the exception of Irish potatoes harvested before January 1, 1949, milk and milk products, hogs, chickens, and eggs, which were required to be supported at 90 percent of parity or comparable price. This act also amended the act of August 5, 1947, by extending to June 30, 1950, the period during which mandatory support must be made available on wool; and stated the policy of Congress that the other price support operations of the Department should be carried out until January 1, 1950, so as to bring the income of producers of other commodities to a fair parity relationship, to the extent that funds remained available, with the basic and Steagall commodities and wool.

The Agricultural Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 1051) provided mandatory support at levels not in excess of 90 percent of parity nor less than certain prescribed minimums for the basic commodities; provided mandatory support for wool and mohair, tung nuts, honey, Irish potatoes, milk and milk products, at levels between 60 and 90 percent of parity (between 75 and 90 percent of parity in the case of milk and milk products); authorized price support at levels not in excess of 90 percent of parity for other nonbasic commodities, subject to consideration being given to specified factors; and provided that insofar as feasible, price support should be made available on any storable nonbasic commodity for which a marketing quota or marketing agreement or order program is in effect. The act of March 31, 1950 (64 Stat. 42) prohibited price support for potatoes of the 1951 and subsequent crops unless marketing quotas are in effect. There is no legislation which authorizes marketing quotas on potatoes.

Section 106 (a) of the act of June 30, 1952 (66 Stat. 298), amending the Defense Production Act, provided for price support at 90 percent of parity for the basic commodities under any program announced while

title IV of the Defense Production Act authorizing price controls was in effect. Title IV expired as of April 30, 1953.

The act of July 17, 1952 (66 Stat. 758), amending the Agricultural Act of 1949, provides for 90 percent of parity price support for the 1953 and 1954 crops of the basic commodities with respect to which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas. The act also provides that the price-support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 shall apply separately to American upland cotton and to extra-long staple cotton; however, the level of support for extra-long staple cotton of the 1953 crop must be in the same relationship to that of American upland cotton as the relationship of their average farm prices during the period 1936–1942.

The Agricultural Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 897) allows price support for the basic commodities at the levels provided for in the Agricultural Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 1051) to go into effect beginning with the 1955 crops, except that for the 1955 crops the minimum level of price support for the basic commodities will be 82½ percent of parity. Extra-long staple cotton is required to be supported at the minimum level between 75 and 90 percent of parity specified in the price-support schedule for the supply as of the beginning of the marketing year for the crop. The Secretary's discretion to support basic commodities between the minimum level and 90 percent of parity will not apply in the case of extra-long staple cotton. The act provides for the support of wool and mohair beginning April 1, 1955, through payments to producers financed out of import duties on wool, at such incentive level not to exceed 110 percent of parity as the Secretary determines necessary to encourage an annual domestic production of approximately 300 million pounds. The act gives the Secretary discretionary authority to support the price of potatoes at not in excess of 90 percent of parity. The act of March 31, 1950 (64 Stat. 42), prohibiting price support for potatoes unless marketing quotas are in effect has been repealed.

AUTHORITY FOR THE SUPPLY PROGRAM

This program is carried out under section 5 (c) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act which provides authority to—

"(c) Procure agricultural commodities for sale to other Government agencies, foreign governments, and domestic, foreign, or international relief or rehabilitation agencies, and to meet domestic requirements."

In this connection section 4 of the act of July 16, 1943 (15 U. S. C. 7130–9), specifically requires that the Corporation be fully reimbursed for services performed, losses sustained, and operating costs incurred or commodities purchased or delivered to or on behalf of any other Government agency. Prior to the enactment of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act this program was carried out under the broad authority of the Corporation's Delaware charter.

AUTHORITY FOR THE FOREIGN PURCHASE PROGRAM

This was largely a wartime program carried out under the Corporation's general Delaware charter authority and the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act. Its principal purpose was the acquisition of supplies needed for foreign and domestic requirements. It was approved by the President of the United States on April 28, 1942, and the Corporation was designated by the Board of Economic Warfare on May 16, 1952, as the sole agency for the purchase of agricultural commodities in foreign countries. With the exception of Cuban sugar and Canadian purchases, the program was transferred to the Foreign Economic Administration by Executive Order 9385 of October 6, 1943, and transferred back to the Department of Agriculture by Executive Order 9630 of September 27, 1945.

AUTHORITY FOR EMERGENCY FEED PROGRAM

This program is carried out under the authority added to section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 by section 301 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 with respect to making farm commodities available in relieving distress in distress or disaster areas.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMODITY EXPORT PROGRAM

The purpose of this program is to retain foreign markets and aid in the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities. Authority for the program is contained in sections 5 (d) and 5 (f) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act as well as other provisions of that act and the broad authority of the Delaware charter. Prior to the enactment of section 21c of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 statutory prohibitions against sales below the parity or comparable price of the commodity restricted the Corporation's authority to engage in these activities. Section 407 (F) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 permits sales for export at unrestricted prices.

AUTHORITY FOR THE STORAGE FACILITIES PROGRAM

This program includes storage bins and other storage facilities acquired or contracted for under the Delaware charter, or section 4 (h) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, loans for storage facilities under section 4 (h) and other provisions of that act, and guaranteed storage agreements under sections 34 and 41 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended by sections 417 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as well as under various provisions of the Corporation's charter.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 577, House bill 6499.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6499) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is not planned to debate the bill this afternoon. It is the general Government appropriation bill, involving appropriations for the Executive Office of the President, the Council of Economic Advisers, and other agencies. It is planned to proceed with the consideration of the bill shortly after the morning hour tomorrow.

SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE, DOCTOR OF LETTERS

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on June 18, 1955, our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] received an honorary degree of doctor of letters from the Drexel Institute of Technology at Philadelphia, and on that occasion she delivered a very interesting address. It is a very helpful address so far as America is concerned. In her address she made the statement: "The best thing our Government can give us is the opportunity for self-development."

I ask unanimous consent that the citation given to the Senator from Maine when she received the honorary degree of doctor of letters and her very able address on that occasion be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the citation and the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOCTOR OF LETTERS, HONORIS CAUSA MARGARET CHASE SMITH, SUCCESSFUL BUSINESSWOMAN, ABLE JOURNALIST, AND HONORED PUBLIC SERVANT

Through her record in the Congress of the United States as a Representative and as a Senator from the State of Maine, she has become a distinguished public figure, the only woman to have served in both branches of our highest legislative body.

One-time teacher and newspaper and business executive, she was chosen to fill out an unexpired term in the House of Representatives in 1940. Returned to office repeatedly by unprecedented majorities, she was elected in 1954 to serve another senatorial term.

Her legislative services have stemmed from her diligence in committee work, now a potent force in National Government; and she has assumed responsibilities in this connection altogether worthy of the sturdiest among her senatorial colleagues. Her independent and courageous interpretation for many years of public issues and challenges through a syndicated newspaper column earned for her recognition as an informed and effective commentator.

Appreciation of her manifold activities may be measured by the long list of honors conferred upon her. She has been repeatedly designated woman of the year and has been rated among the six best of the Senators by leading political scientists of the United States. In 1955, she was selected as 1 of the 4 most admired women in the world by the Gallup poll.

Successful businesswoman, skilled interpreter of vital issues, and conscientious public servant, her career is a brilliant example of the achievements of women in high affairs of state, and stands as an inspiration to all who would devote their talents to the welfare of our country.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE

President Creese, trustees and officers of Drexel, members of the faculty, distinguished guests, men and women of Drexel, and friends of Drexel, I have looked forward to coming to Drexel for some time now. I have because of the very great esteem that is held for your institution. And I always like to return to Philadelphia—the City of Brotherly Love.

In a way, Philadelphia seems like another home to me. For Philadelphia was the very first place I came and made my first speech after winning the Senatorial nomination for the first time. That was back at the 1948 Republican National Convention.

And my column that was carried by the Bulletin here for 5 years brought such a kindly response from Philadelphia readers that I came to think of them as I would next-door neighbors. If I am ever tempted to return to the heavy chores of writing a column again it will be because of such inspirational experiences as I received from Philadelphia on daily publication of my views.

There are many other things about my experiences with Philadelphia that make me feel as though I am one of you. But there

is none that makes me prouder than the honor that Drexel Institute of Technology grants me today.

Drexel Institute is truly an integral part of the traditions of your great metropolis that cradled the Declaration of Independence. That historic Declaration emphasized that our Creator had endowed in us the inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Drexel has kept the faith of the Declaration in that the object of Drexel training has been to open for its students the way of happiness through usefulness.

In faithful adherence to its illustrious founder and to its many dedicated philanthropists, Drexel has always been sensitive and adaptable to social and economic change. In keeping that faith with the eminently successful men and women who have made this great institution, Drexel has thus met the needs of thousands of students.

Two basic ingredients in happiness are freedom and security. To those of you who graduate today to go forth to make your place in the sun, to stand on your own feet, Drexel has given you excellent tools with which to pursue and capture happiness.

It has cultivated your value of freedom. It has shown you the way to be free and remain free—and how to protect not only your freedom but the freedom of your fellow man and of those less fortunate than you.

It has trained you in the ways of achieving security—security for yourselves and your families, whether they be present or future. It has trained you in productivity of various kinds. It has shown you how you can use your talents to contribute to the security of your fellow men and the security of your country.

Freedom is everybody's responsibility. It's something so taken for granted in our American way of life that we are rarely aware of it. Freedoms only come to seem important to many of us when we have lost them. They are intangibles that elusively escape our normal five senses of sight, hearing, smell, taste, and touch.

We can't see freedoms, we can't hear freedoms, we can't smell freedoms, we can't eat freedoms, and we can't grab freedoms in our hands. Because we can't, we are always in danger of losing the intangible freedoms gradually and without realizing it—to put it another way, without sensing it.

In a world of increasing materialism, this danger of loss of freedom is all the greater. As we become more materialistic and place greater emphasis upon the tangible things of life—the things we can see, hear, smell, taste, and touch—the greater grows the conflict between security and freedom. Security has a great advantage in that it can be reduced to tangibles.

Security can be translated into physical terms, while freedom is measured more in terms of the mind and the spirit. Important parts of security are food and shelter. They are materialistic tangibles, necessities of life. You can see, smell, taste, and touch them. To use a graphic phrase, food is something you can sink your teeth in. Freedom isn't.

You and your Government control the freedom that is enjoyed in this country. The less you exercise and jealously guard that freedom the more you surrender the authority and responsibility for freedom to your Government—and the more the Government controls and regulates your daily life and your destiny, the more the Government becomes a dispenser of promised security and the less it remains a guardian of freedom.

Shirking of individual responsibility is outright surrender of individual authority. Freedom is bartered for security. That does not mean to say that freedom and security are incompatibles. To the contrary, they can go hand in hand. But when they get out of balance the conflict starts.

Where should our Government stand on freedom and security? How have these concepts been developed? From where do they spring? What type of social system has maintained the best balance of freedom and security? Answers are indicated in past history.

The first formally recorded guide of freedom was relayed to the world by Moses when he brought the Ten Commandments down from Mount Sinai. Their common basis was the ordained freedom of everyone from arbitrary and unlawful interference with his life and his property.

This freedom from which all freedoms spring was formally revived and recorded by the Magna Carta in 1215. It was reasserted in our Declaration of Independence. It was refined and delineated in our Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to our Constitution. From the Ten Commandments to the 10 amendments freedom has been defined.

Yet there is a limitation to man's basic freedom—the freedom to be let alone. That limitation is that in the exercise of that freedom we cannot so use our freedom as to invade the right of others to be let alone. One man's freedom stops where another man's freedom begins.

Because individual selfishness either can't or won't recognize where that line of separation is, we have to have what we call government. That government operates on laws that draw the lines of individual freedom—that punish the crimes of murder, robbery and other acts that invade the freedom of the individual to be let alone.

Where the line of freedom is drawn between the individual and his government varies and determines the kind of government. On the one extreme, it is the state of society where there is no government at all, no law and no order. That is anarchy—no government control at all. On the other extreme is the state of society where the government controls everything. That has been called "statism."

Somewhere between the extremes of anarchy and the so-called "statism," there is a happy medium—an ideal balance between freedom and security that establishes order and eradicates injustice and poverty.

Man has tried a myriad of systems—monarchies, dictatorships, oligarchies, autocracies, democracies, republics. I think, and I believe achievement records of history show, that the nearest to the perfect, happy medium has been our Federal Republic with its system of checks and balances through the separation of authority into the legislative, executive and judicial.

This, together with the individual immunity provided by the Bill of Rights, has established history's greatest safeguard of individual freedom and order. Government our American way has been government the best way.

Just as man has tinkered with various types of political government so has he experimented with various types of economic systems in the pursuit of prosperity. He has run the gamut of the "isms"—capitalism, socialism, communism, fascism, and statism—and the greatest of these has been capitalism—not unrestrained and unlimited capitalism, but capitalism the American way, limited by laws restraining monopoly.

It has given us the highest standard of living man has ever known—and the highest standard of freedom man has ever enjoyed. Under it the ownership of land and natural wealth, the production, distribution, and exchange of goods, and the operation of the system itself, are effected by private enterprise and control under competitive conditions.

Freedom the American way is twofold. There is the positive freedom to do something. Sometimes we call this liberty. There is the negative freedom from something. Sometimes we call this immunity.

Woodrow Wilson had something to say about liberty that I think is worth repeating when we start thinking about government and freedom. He said:

"Liberty has never come from the government. Liberty has always come from the subjects of it. The history of liberty is a history of limitations of governmental powers, not the increase of it." On the score of the basic freedom of the right to be let alone, Abraham Lincoln superbly but simply stated the thought with:

"I believe each individual is naturally entitled to do as he pleases with himself and the fruits of his labor, so far as it in no wise interferes with any other man's rights."

This was the observation of a great humanitarian who could never be accused of prejudice against the acceptance of welfare responsibility by the government.

Perhaps Thomas Jefferson stated the proper balance of freedom and government most tersely when he said: "That government is best that governs least."

When we recall this statement of his we may also recall that he was our representative to France when that country was governed completely by statism. It cannot be said that Jefferson never saw statism in action.

The preservation of individual freedom requires a reasonable minimum of social security so that the shirkers can compare what is attainable to thrifty workers with what a benevolent government provides for those who take only the advantages and shirk all of the disadvantages of daily earning their way.

No government can devise a system of security that will completely eliminate the struggle in life. The test-proven way of successfully meeting the struggle of life is self-development. The best thing that our Government can give to you and me is not a State-controlled security or special advantage but rather the opportunity for self-development.

You and I cannot escape the fact that the ultimate responsibility for freedom is personal. Our freedoms today are not so much in danger because people are consciously trying to take them away from us as they are in danger because we forget to use them.

Freedom may be an intangible but like most everything else it can die because of lack of use. Freedom unexercised may be freedom forfeited.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY PRESIDENT DANIEL J. RIESNER BEFORE THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CLUB

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on April 27 the reelected president of the National Republican Club delivered a very interesting address at the club's annual meeting. I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY MR. DANIEL J. RIESNER, NEWLY REELECTED PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CLUB, AT THE CLUB'S ANNUAL MEETING

Members of the National Republican Club, my gratification at the great honor you have bestowed upon me by reelecting me as your president is deep and profound, for it has been a tremendous privilege to serve at the helm of this vital organization. This is no ordinary club. Its prestige is nationwide, and all Republican Presidents since Benjamin Harrison have belonged to it. President Eisenhower became an honorary member last June, and I had the privilege to present to him his certificate of life

membership at the White House. At that time, the President was gracious enough to say: "This is one picture I want. This certifies I am a Republican."

Many other illustrious Republicans presently are members of this organization, including Leonard Hall, our national chairman, and former Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, to whom this club gave its first annual award recently for outstanding and sustained public service. Likewise, United States Senator IRVING M. IVES and Attorney General Jacob K. Javits are members.

From this organization there have emanated many new and important policy-making plans for our party. For instance, on February 12—Lincoln's birthday—our executive committee passed unanimously a resolution calling for the draft of the President for a second term as a prime necessity to national well-being and the peace of the world. From the club on that day came a clarion call to its members in all 48 States to organize themselves for a groundswell movement to get the Eisenhower draft rolling in ever-increasing proportions. Following our lead, many other groups drafted similar resolutions, and we fully anticipate that this tide will develop into a wave that will sweep the President into office for a second term, after he is nominated by acclamation by the 1956 Republican Convention. The National Republican Club, proud of its 76-year-old history as an important cog in the national GOP movement, has again demonstrated how it has stood in the foreground of progressive Republican action for well-nigh fourscore years.

The draft and subsequent reelection of the President is a must for America. He stands head and shoulders above all the contentiousness expressed in American politics. He is in every sense the President of all the people. He typifies and symbolizes character, achievement and leadership, and has contributed confidence and faith in the future not only to the people of this country, but to those of the entire world. The tone of his administration is such that its character is enhancing the moral fiber of all civilized peoples. He knows how to handle delicate international situations without upsetting the applecart.

Witness the concrete results this administration has given us. It has brought about a cease-fire in Korea, and no American blood is being shed there now. Its leadership resulted in silencing the guns in Indochina as well. The serious Iranian oil dispute was brought under control by an agreement sparked by the administration. In our own hemisphere, the Guatemalan people, inspired by American ideals, stabilized their own government along democratic lines and rejected Communist influence most convincingly.

Perhaps the most tremendous and far-reaching accomplishment of the administration's foreign policy, one which may very well go down in history as the single most important stroke in forcing the Soviet rulers to abandon their power-mad idea of world conquest, was the series of agreements in Paris which are bringing about West German rearmament and getting the West German Government into NATO. Already, these agreements have been ratified by Great Britain, Italy, Germany, and France, and the Russian Red Bear is on the run in Europe. In Asia, as well, the similar SEATO agreements have brought hope for peace in that part of the world. Witness too, President Eisenhower's Formosa resolution, which served notice on the Chinese Communists that this Nation desires peace, and that the best way to keep the peace is to serve notice that no more aggression can be allowed. Remember, by contrast, how the Democrat Truman administration first practically invited the Communists into South Korea, and then plunged us into a war to chase them back over the 38th parallel.

The President lived and breathed military strategy throughout the vast portion of his adult life, yet he is devoted and dedicated to the cause of real peace. He keeps his powder dry and still leaves no stone unturned to keep the guns silent.

Grasping the fact that the world is getting smaller and that its peoples definitely need more understanding of each other, he sent Vice President NIXON on two highly successful goodwill tours. When the Vice President visited 19 countries and 7 other areas on his 45,000-mile Far Eastern trip in 1953, that was a mission in the cause of world peace through mutual understanding. So also, was the Vice President's recent month-long plane tour of Caribbean and Central American nations.

This is the affirmative way of preserving the peace—the Eisenhower way—by developing the already good relations between this country and the legislative bodies, rulers and peoples of faraway lands in an ever-shrinking world.

Eisenhower's treatment of the cold war, typified by such good-neighborliness, is proving an effective antidote to the Russian ruthlessness. Again, we must contrast all of this Republican administration's foreign policy accomplishments with the weakness and vacillation of the preceding Democratic administrations, which spawned the notorious agreements at Yalta and Potsdam, for instance, that resulted in a succession of Russian victories and buildups. We now find at least a good indication that this trend of aggression is being reversed.

We have witnessed during this administration a crack-up in the Russian top-echelon command. I believe that President Eisenhower's strong foreign policy and his love of peace, which put the pressure directly on the Communist leaders for a change, was primarily responsible for that crack-up, which found Dictator Malenkov losing his power and which resulted in Marshal Zhukov being given high office. Zhukov has publicly praised President Eisenhower as a man of peace, and relations might get a little better with the Kremlin because of the Marshal's influence. Man-to-man, at least, they enjoyed a good relationship in the last campaigns in World War II, as well as immediately after V–E Day.

For too long, under Democrat administrations, we in this country have been kept off balance by Russian maneuvers. Now, the shoe is on the other foot—and the Kremlin knows it.

This administration's foreign policy has brought about the most drastic action for peace by the Kremlin gang since the cessation of hostilities. Almost frantically, the Russians have offered an agreement that would return sovereignty to the Austrian people. Such a move could only result from the consummate fear on the part of the Soviet bureaucrats that the Eisenhower way is winning. The rulers of Soviet Russia realize—at long last—that they cannot push Ike and the American people around any longer. There will be no Yaltas under Eisenhower.

The world is a tinderbox, but without the administration approach to the tough problems, anything might have happened. One mistake might very well have plunged the world into the furies of modern warfare, but the situation has been kept under control remarkably well. By contrast, this Nation was embroiled in worldwide wars under every Democratic President in the last generation and a half.

I have no hesitancy in saying that this new anti-cold-war policy owes its success in a large measure not only to Republicans but to the contribution of some public-spirited, patriotic Democrats in Congress who have supplied the necessary loyal opposition leadership to strengthen the President's hand in dealing with the Communist menace.

I refer particularly to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia. Senator GEORGE demonstrated this conclusively when he denounced as "not at all conducive to peace" the demands in some quarters for the administration to telegraph our punches to the Chinese Reds in the ticklish Far-Eastern situation. Senator GEORGE likewise demonstrated this real loyal opposition when he stood up steadfastly in the Senate for the Formosa resolution, for the Paris agreements, and for the administration's foreign aid and foreign trade programs.

Only the other day, he went to bat again for the Eisenhower mutual security program, which envisages the allocation of $3,530,000,000, of which about two-thirds is earmarked for the free nations of Asia to stave off the serious threats of communism.

The cooperation with the administration of Senator GEORGE has made a real bipartisan foreign policy possible. It is not enough to give lip service to the idea of bipartisanship. There must also be a real spirit of placing the welfare of this country first and foremost, in order to make it work. I am happy to be able to pay this tribute to a Democrat, who, in my opinion, has done so much for his country and for the furtherance of a foreign policy calculated to stop aggression and bring us lasting peace.

How different are the activities of Senator GEORGE from the antics of the "big mouths," the small-minded members of their political party like Adlai Stevenson, Paul Butler, their national chairman, and Harry Truman. The members of this truculent trio profess to belong to the loyal oppocition, but they merely give lip service. They fool no one.

Adlai, Paul, and Harry, the smear-leaders on the American political scene, are not even goods for laughs these days. They "had it," as the saying goes. The people elected Dwight D. Eisenhower because they were sick and tired of the stupid and dangerous manner in which this country was being run, both on the domestic and international fronts.

It behooves all of us, Republicans and Democrats alike, then, to work for the Nation's goals of lasting peace and prosperity.

Not alone has the President given us peace, but he has accomplished in peacetime what the Democrats could only do with war and bloodshed; that is, give us a prosperous economy. Commerce Secretary Weeks stated recently that this year has a "good chance" of being the best business one ever.

That is understandable, for the number of idle workers, according to latest reports, dropped by more than 200,000 in 1 month, while the total civilian employment rose by 500,000 to 60,500,000 workers in the same period of time. Unemployment fell to 3,200,000 workers in March from 3,400,000 in February of this year, and 3,700,000 about a year ago. Meanwhile, there have been widespread gains in factory employment in recent months. So excellent is our economic resurgence that even "gloom and doom" Senator PAUL DOUGLAS has admitted on the record that "economic recovery is here; it is real."

The President has accomplished the highly difficult transition from war to peace without disturbing the country's economic balance. If that balance had been destroyed, the world's stability would likewise have been thrown out of kilter, with possible disastrous results. Instead, foreign country after foreign country has grown economically healthier during this administration.

British austerity has given way to income tax cuts there. Business is booming in Germany and Japan as these countries make great strides to rebuild their war damage. France and Italy are gradually working their way back to a better economic climate. Thus, the world is getting economically healthier, and that is all to the good, for

sick economies breed wars, while healthy ones make for peace.

The administration, by its down-to-earth, commonsense mutual security, foreign trade and foreign aid program, is helping our allies to help themselves, thereby bolstering world economic conditions in a manner that will stand up. Nations in underdeveloped areas of the world are also being helped to get into the economic swim of things. Eventually, what helps other natins will reciprocally help us, too.

Thus, not alone do the people of the United States, but those of the world, need Ike now and will need him for a second term. The question is not whether any other Republican can be elected President or not. The paramount issue is that we all need Ike. I like Ike, you like Ike, and the world likes Ike.

This, then, is the shape of things to come. I predict that because of the Eisenhower popularity, peace and prosperity, the President will be drafted by acclamation at the Republican National Convention in San Francisco in the summer of 1956. He will then be victorious on election day by an even more smashing margin than in 1952. His plurality will be of landslide proportions.

The most recent poll by the American Institute of Public Opinion reveals this trend. It shows that Ike's personal popularity is steadily climbing. Seventy-one percent of those polled said in no uncertain terms that they approve of the way the President is handling his job. Only 16 percent disapproved. The remaining 13 percent was listed as undecided.

The President is sure of a second term as Chief Executive—no matter who runs against him, or what kind of a campaign is waged by the opposition.

So, I wish to take this opportunity to thank the members of the National Republican Club for having strongly gone on record urging the President's draft and reelection, and for having initiated the grassroots "Draft Ike" movement throughout the country. We can all be extremely proud of our efforts in this cause. The members of this club have certainly upheld our tradition of always doing what is best for our country, and best for our party.

THE BIG FOUR MEETING AT THE SUMMIT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk, and ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to submit it at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Reserving the right to object, is the resolution which the Senator from Wisconsin desires to submit the resolution which was placed on the desk of all Senators earlier today?

Mr. McCARTHY. It is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am somewhat reluctant to object to the submission of any resolution, particularly if it is planned to follow the regular procedure and refer the resolution to the proper committee. As the Senator from Wisconsin knows, one objection would prevent his resolution from being submitted at this time. I do not object to the submission of the resolution, and I do not object to its consideration, if it follows orderly procedure in the Senate. However, as I stated to the Senator earlier, I do not believe, as majority leader and as the one who must attempt to work out procedure for 96 Senators, that I should assume the responsibility of having the Senate act on foreign policy between quorum calls.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am merely asking for the right to submit the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand, and the Senator has that right during the morning hour.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say that my reason for doing it at this time——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I may say that under the rules the Senator may submit the resolution during the morning hour. However, Mr. President, we have just finished a heavy day's work. It is 20 minutes to 6 o'clock. The normal procedure to be followed in this case would be for the Senator from Wisconsin to submit his resolution during the morning hour. It would then be referred to the appropriate committee. However, I gathered from what the Senator said that he does not want to follow the regular procedure, but that he wants to ask unanimous consent to submit the resolution now, and that subsequently he hopes to ask unanimous consent for its consideration without its being referred to a committee.

I believe the Senator would save time if he would be willing to submit it and to have it referred to the appropriate committee immediately. The Senator from Texas will seek to have the committee consider it. I am sure the distinguished minority leader will join in that request. In that way I believe the Senator's purpose can be served and at the same time we will operate in an orderly manner.

I have only read the resolution hastily and I have not analyzed it. I would be the last to take the position that the Senate should not give consideration to some of the matters included in the resolution. However, I desire to be prudent and not have the Senate called upon to act on a resolution which has not followed the regular procedure.

If the Senator from Wisconsin has no objection, I will be glad to have him submit his resolution today, which is not in accordance with the rule, as the Senator knows, provided he will agree to have the resolution appropriately referred, with the request that the committee give consideration to it. As he knows, the Committee on Foreign Relations would have jurisdiction of the resolution.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations is not on the floor. He is confined to the hospital. This is a rather unusual procedure, and I do not wish to have the Senate get into the habit of legislating foreign policy between quorum calls.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say that I had no thought or hope of getting a vote on the resolution tonight. The resolution concerns the conference now going on at San Francisco. Time is of the essence. For that reason I assumed that I would be granted the courtesy which is normally granted to a Senator. Every day Senators submit resolutions during the morning hour and there is no objection. The Senator from Texas may have an objection when I make my next unanimous-consent request, but I do not believe he should object to the mere submission of the resolution at this time, in order to save a day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas is always reluctant to object to any procedure on this floor. However, he has an obligation to the Members of the Senate. It is my understanding that the Senator from Wisconsin desires, first, to ask unanimous consent to submit the resolution at this time, and, second, to ask unanimous consent to have the resolution considered without its being referred to a committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Why is not the Senator from Wisconsin willing to have the resolution referred to the committee and to ask the committee to consider it and to submit a report on it to the Senate? Time can be saved in that way, and it would be the orderly procedure to follow. The Senator's resolution probably would gain more strength if he followed the orderly procedure than if Senators felt it had been taken up in an unusual manner.

Mr. McCARTHY. I hope the Senator does not object to the submission of the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And I hope that the Senator does not object to its being referred to the committee. That is where we stand. I do not object to its submission. I do not know that I will object to the resolution. However, I want to have some time in which to consider it and to learn what is in it. I want to know why the Senator does not wish the resolution to be considered by the committee. It could be referred immediately.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will tell the Senator from Texas why. I have another resolution before the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is as important as this one. The other resolution was submitted about 3 months ago, and it was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It has to do with dealing with Red China, where Americans are being held in prison.

The committee has not held any hearings on that resolution, and I have not heard anything about it from the committee. The Big Four ministers are now meeting in San Francisco, and the resolution concerns what they are doing. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations is ill, and I could hardly expect that the resolution I intend to submit would come to a hearing before the committee until after the San Francisco meeting ends. For that reason I intend to ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution. Although I assume objection will be made to that request, I do not believe the Senator from Texas should object to my submitting the resolution. If I were permitted to submit it at this time, it could be printed in the RECORD, and tomorrow all Senators would know what is contained in it. If I ask for its immediate consideration, the Senator may object to it. That will be an entirely different matter, however.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I believe there is some merit to the position taken by the Senator from Wisconsin. I would be very reluctant to raise any question about it, except for the very unusual procedure the Senator from Wisconsin

is following in this instance. The Senator has had all year in which to submit his resolution.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have not done anything unusual yet.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I was informed that the Senator had it in mind to do so, and I inquired of him, and he was courteous enough to outline his plan. I shall not object to the submission of the resolution, but I should like to say to the Senator and to every other Member of the Senate, so that they may be on notice—as I said to the Senator from Alabama the other day when he submitted a resolution regarding Miss Helen Keller—that I do not think there is any resolution so important that it cannot stand the scrutiny of Members of the Senate committee. I am not passing judgment on the Senator's resolution, but so long as I am majority leader we are not going to legislate foreign policy on the floor of the Senate between quorum calls, as the sun is going down, and when there are only half a dozen Members on the floor. It does not come at an appropriate time. It should be submitted tomorrow, during the morning hour, and referred to the appropriate committee. I serve notice that I am going to move to refer the resolution to the appropriate committee. If the Senator would permit that to be done it would save time. I hope that every Member who cares anything about the traditions of the Senate will support the majority leader when the time comes.

Mr. McCARTHY. How soon will that be?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have attempted to assure my friend from Wisconsin that if he will give me an opportunity to make a study of the resolution—I have been a busy man most of today—I shall try to study it tonight. I shall confer with the appropriate Members in the morning, and I shall be glad to discuss it with the Senator further. I have no desire to keep any Senator from expressing any view he may possess or to keep his view from being recorded. But the resolution would have a better chance of appealing to the intelligence of Members of this body if it followed the orderly procedure. I am sure the minority leader will agree with me.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am acting minority leader at this time, as the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has retired from the floor to do some officework, but I believe the majority leader has stated the rules correctly and that he has not been unreasonable.

I read the document on my desk when I first entered the Chamber this afternoon. What the effect of it may be on the conference at the United Nations anniversary in San Francisco I am not capable of determining at this time. I would certainly want the Foreign Relations Committee and its staff to examine the resolution and make their recommendation before I would be willing officially to act upon it as a Member of the Senate. There may be problems involved that I cannot foresee just from having hurriedly read the document. Therefore, Mr. President, I concur with the majority leader in his contention that the resolution should be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wonder if this would be agreeable to the Senator from Wisconsin:

I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin be permitted to submit his resolution at this time and that it be referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

If consent is given, it would not be an unusual procedure. The Senator's rights would be fully protected. The committee would have before it a printed resolution, and subsequently the Senator could make his request for action on the resolution.

So far as I am concerned—and I hope the minority leader will feel likewise, for he is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee—we could ask that the committee give its attention to the resolution, and if it reports the resolution I can assure the Senator that it will receive prompt action, as all other measures have received prompt action this year. If the committee does not report the resolution, then he can adopt some other course. But the Senator would at least have made the attempt in cooperation with the majority leader, to follow the procedures and rules of the Senate and the traditions of the Senate.

Mr. President, I make the unanimous-consent request that the Senator from Wisconsin be permitted to submit his resolution and that it be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not ask for that, Mr. President.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I asked for it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I object to it. I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to submit the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the Senator determined not to let the resolution go to the committee?

Mr. McCARTHY. Frankly, I intend to make another unanimous-consent request, namely, that the Senate immediately consider the resolution, not with the thought of getting a vote on it tonight, if the Senator from Texas objects to that. I have a perfect right to make such a request. There is no violation of any Senate rules involved.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The rules provide that resolutions shall be presented during the morning hour. There are only two Members on my side of the aisle at this time. The Senator did not give me any notice——

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, may I correct the majority leader. There are 3 Members on the other side of the aisle, including himself, and on my side there are 4 Members.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank my friend for moving one Senator over to my side of the aisle.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, if the Senator is going to object because there are so few Senators present, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That can be done, but Members were told that there would be no further business this evening. I see no reason why the Senator from Wisconsin could not protect his rights by the procedure which I have suggested. I hope the Senator will not object to my request that he follow the procedure which I think every Member of the Senate has followed concerning every resolution submitted at this session. I know of no exception.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have made the simple request that I be allowed to submit my resolution. I have made no further request. Such requests have been made day after day, and I have never heard any objection being made. Bills are introduced all during the day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I asked unanimous consent that the Senator be permitted to submit his resolution and that it be referred immediately to the Foreign Relations Committee. But the Senator said he would object. I appeal to him to come and let us reason together. I think the Senator is expressing a lack of confidence by his unwillingness to let the committee consider the resolution. They will have a chance to review the Senator's resolution, and it could be that the Senator may find some member of the committee who would agree with him.

Mr. McCARTHY. That could be. I was courteous and I told the Senator from Texas that I intended to offer a resolution. I called him over——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Of course the Senator was courteous, but I was informed that a very highly unusual procedure was likely to be taken at the conclusion of the discussion of the defense appropriation bill. I was told that the Senator would submit in mimeograph form what purported to be a resolution, and would ask for immediate action on it.

We are not suspicious people, but when we see a mimeographed resolution distributed we know the normal thing to do is to have it submitted, have it sent to the printer, and have printed copies distributed. But here was a mimeographed resolution. I was not called over by the Senator from Wisconsin. I went over and said to him, "What do you plan to do about this?" Whereupon, he said he wanted to submit it and wanted to ask for its consideration. At that time I expressed the hope that my friend from Wisconsin would follow the usual procedure.

I am not indicating whether I shall favor the resolution or not, because, very frankly, I have not had an opportunity to study it. But the committee would have the resolution for its consideration, before the Senate could act; and the Senator says he does not want any action taken on it this evening.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator realizes that if I ask for immediate consideration of the resolution, and he objects, the resolution cannot be considered. If the Senator wants to move to refer the resolution to the committee, he can do so. I am merely taking the first step and am asking unanimous consent to submit the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And I have just taken my first step by asking unanimous consent that the Senator be permitted to submit the resolution and that it be referred to the committee. If later the Senator should want to move to dis-

charge the committee, he could do so. I know the parliamentary semantics. The Senator from Wisconsin, I feel certain, has been upstairs a time or two in his life. He knows what he has in mind.

The Senator apparently would like to feel that his resolution has no chance of being considered by the committee. I do not approach the question with such cynicism. If the Senator's resolution were referred to committee, I think he could get the committee to take action. I do not know whether it would be favorable action.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am asking for the right to submit a resolution. That is a courtesy which is extended to every Senator, day after day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. All I am asking for is the right to have the resolution referred to a committee, which is what happens to every resolution submitted.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Texas can object to my request for the immediate consideraaion of the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas is aware of what he can object to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then the resolution will be referred to the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. All I am trying to do is to appeal to the Senator from Wisconsin not to object to having the resolution referred to the committee. I have made that request.

Mr. President, I repeat my unanimous-consent request that the Senator from Wisconsin may have the right, out of order, to submit his resolution; and that the resolution be referred forthwith to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have a ruling on my request?

Mr. McCARTHY. I want to change the Senator's unanimous-consent request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I can formulate my own unanimous-consent requests. I ask the Chair to put the question, please.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall have to object, as, of course, the Senator knows I shall.

Let us not play around. Either the Senator will allow me to submit the resolution, or he will object. If he objects, there is nothing I can do about the situation except to wait until tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think the Senator is correct. But I think I will show him more courtesy than he has shown me.

I shall have no objection to the Senator's submitting the resolution. I am sorry he has so little faith in his own resolution and in a committee of the Senate that he refuses to permit the resolution to follow the ordinary procedure.

But I have no objection to the Senator's submitting the resolution. I had hoped I could prevail upon him to conform to the procedure which is followed by all his colleagues on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the resolution being submitted out of order? The Chair hears none, and the resolution will be received.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to serve notice on the Presiding Officer, the members of the staff, and the Senate itself—both these present and those not present—that I have no intention, so long as the Senate will follow my recommendation, of having resolutions involving the foreign policy of the Nation presented between quorum calls and acted upon late in the evening, without reference to a committee. I shall insist that the dignity of the Senate be maintained and that the regular procedures of the Senate be followed regardless of who asks otherwise.

Mr. McCARTHY. I intend to make only a unanimous-consent request; then I will yield to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to read paragraph 6 of rule XIV, on page 21 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, as follows:

> All resolutions shall lie over 1 day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am aware of that rule. I now make another unanimous-consent request. I call the attention of the majority leader to the fact that I have no intention of requesting a vote on the resolution tonight.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Did not the Senator from Wisconsin tell me he would not make a request for immediate consideration of the resolution today?

Mr. McCARTHY. I must make it today, otherwise it will be referred to committee. If the Senator is misinformed, he can withdraw his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator need have no illusions at all about what I intend to do.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have no illusions, but I have no intention of trying to push for a vote on the resolution tonight.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What is the purpose of the Senator's request?

Mr. McCARTHY. It will make the resolution the pending business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There is already unfinished business.

Mr. McCARTHY. My reason for proceeding in this fashion is that, regardless of how the Committee on Foreign Relations may or may not act, I have no confidence that the committee will act on the resolution within this week's time. It will take much longer than that. By the time action is taken the conference of the four Ministers will have ended.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I object.

Mr. THYE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Why does the Senator from Minnesota wish to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. THYE. I think the minority leader should be present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The minority leader is informed of what is taking place.

Mr. THYE. Not unless the majority leader has informed him, because the acting minority leader has not informed the minority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. My friend from Minnesota interrupted me. What was the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. McCARTHY. I asked unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Of course, I object to that.

Mr. McCARTHY. There has already been an objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will go over.

The clerk will read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 116), as follows:

Whereas under the Constitution of the United States, the Congress and more particularly the Senate, has concurrent responsibility with the Executive Branch for the formulation of the international policies of the United States; and

Whereas the safety, peace and independence of the United States are seriously threatened by the aggressive world Communist movement under the leadership of the Soviet Union, and;

Whereas the United States is pledged to seek the freedom of the millions of people who have already been enslaved by the world Communist movement; and

Whereas the safety, peace and independence of the United States can never be permanently secured, nor the goal of the United States to obtain the freedom of oppressed peoples realized, so long as certain areas of the world remain under Communist control—namely, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania, Eastern Germany, northern Korea, northern Indochina, China, and the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the President has determined to confer with the heads of State of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and France at Geneva, Switzerland on July 18, 1955, with the objective of relieving world tensions and thus of attempting to make more secure the safety, peace and independence of the United States; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union announced on June 13, 1955, and on several occasions prior thereto, that the subject of areas under Communist control would not be discussed by the Soviet Union at said conference between the heads of state; and

Whereas failure to discuss said areas under Communist control at said Geneva meeting implies de jure recognition of Communist domination of said areas, and thus the establishment of a permanent threat to the safety, peace, and independence of the United States; and

Whereas the Secretary of State is meeting with the Foreign Ministers of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and France beginning June 20, 1955, at San Francisco, reportedly to discuss, inter alia, an agenda for the conference between the heads of state: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that at said Foreign Ministers' meeting at San Francisco or at such other meeting or occasion as may be appropriate, prior to any such conference between the heads of state, the Secretary of State should secure the agreement of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and France that the present and future status of the nations of Eastern Europe and Asia now under Communist control shall be a subject for discussion at such conference between the heads of state.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to make it clear that under rule XIV,

whenever a bill or a joint resolution is offered, it shall lie over in the Senate 1 day.

I had hoped that my friend from Wisconsin, first, would not insist on submitting the resolution at this time; second, that if he insisted on following that procedure, he would not make a request for its immediate consideration.

Now that he has done so, I understand the resolution will go to the calendar and will not be eligible for consideration until the Senate has adjourned and the resolution can be called up on another day.

If no other Senator desires the floor, I am prepared at this time to move that the Senate stand in recess.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have not yielded the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Wisconsin had the resolution stated and was seated. Does the Senator desire to speak?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; I desired to make some remarks on the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How long does the Senator expect to take?

Mr. McCARTHY. I had promised to yield to the Senator from Oregon for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Texas have the floor?

Mr. McCARTHY. I had the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Wisconsin was seated. Usually, when a Senator has the floor, he is standing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The Chair rules that the Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no desire to move to adjourn or recess the Senate before every Senator has had a chance to say everything he wants to say, provided it does not take too late tonight. How long does the Senator expect to take?

Mr. McCARTHY. Perhaps I shall introduce my remarks into the RECORD, with a very few brief comments, in view of the fact that I had promised to yield to the Senator from Oregon. Does the Senator from Texas intend to move to recess rather than adjourn?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Oh, yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. What did we do last night, recess or adjourn?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We were not in session last night. Most of us were at church.

Mr. McCARTHY. We usually adjourn, do we not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Senator moves to recess rather than adjourn, that will be another clever way of manipulating——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No. The Senator from Texas is not a manipulator nor is he clever. The Senator from Texas does not propose to be lectured on the way we should proceed. The Senate was not in session on Sunday. The Senator from Texas frequently moves to recess, and frequently moves that the Senate adjourn——

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not yield to the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Wisconsin does not have the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. I had the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. McCARTHY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have just informed the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] that the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, but who is not present in the Chamber at the moment, had previously discussed the resolution with me. The minority leader has no objection to having the Foreign Relations Committee consider the resolution of the Senator from Wisconsin; and, as I have previously informed the Senator from Wisconsin and the entire Senate, the majority leader has no objection to having that done.

Therefore, if the Senator from Wisconsin will permit the resolution to be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, I assure him and I assure the entire Senate—and I do so after a complete understanding with the minority leader—that the two of us will ask the Foreign Relations Committee to meet tomorrow afternoon—inasmuch as the distinguished minority leader has a White House conference tomorrow morning—and give consideration to the resolution of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Senator from Wisconsin be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee; and I assure the Senator from Wisconsin and the other Members of the Senate that the majority leader and the minority leader will be delighted to urge the committee to have a session at the earliest possible date, which we hope will be tomorrow, and in no event later than Wednesday morning.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I am glad to have that assurance by the majority leader. I have complete confidence in his word; I know that when he says he will do that, he will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 116) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for a moment to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate, so I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the remarks I had intended to make this afternoon.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARTHY

I am about to submit a resolution which I hope will resolve a lot of doubts around the country as to where the Senate stands on the question of what the Big Four should discuss at Geneva. There was general agreement in last Thursday's debate that we should negotiate about the Communist satellite countries at the Big Four meeting, but there were marked differences on the question of whether the subject would be discussed. The purpose of this resolution is to remove that question from the area of speculation.

It reads as follows:

"Whereas under the Constitution of the United States, the Congress and more particularly the Senate, has concurrent responsibility with the executive branch for the formulation of the international policies of the United States; and

"Whereas the safety, peace, and independence of the United States are seriously threatened by the aggressive world Communist movement under the leadership of the Soviet Union; and

"Whereas the United States is pledged to seek the freedom of the millions of people who have already been enslaved by the world Communist movement; and

"Whereas the safety, peace, and independence of the United States can never be permanently secured, nor the goal of the United States to obtain the freedom of oppressed peoples realized, so long as certain areas of the world remain under Communist control—namely, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania, Eastern Germany, northern Korea, northern Indochina, China, and the Soviet Union; and

"Whereas the President has determined to confer with the heads of state of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and France at Geneva, Switzerland, on July 18, 1955, with the objective of relieving world tensions and thus of attempting to make more secure the safety, peace, and independence of the United States; and

"Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union announced on June 13, 1955, and on several occasions prior thereto, that the subject of areas under Communist control would not be discussed by the Soviet Union at said conference between the heads of state; and

"Whereas failure to discuss said areas under Communist control at said Geneva meeting implies de jure recognition of Communist domination of said areas, and thus the establishment of a permanent threat to the safety, peace, and independence of the United States; and

"Whereas the Secretary of State is meeting with the Foreign Ministers of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and France beginning June 20, 1955, at San Francisco, reportedly to discuss, inter alia, an agenda for the conference between the heads of state: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that at said Foreign Ministers' meeting at San Francisco or at such other meeting or occasion as may be appropriate, prior to any such conference between the heads of state, the Secretary of State should secure the agreement of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and France that the disposition of the nations of eastern Europe and Asia now under Communist control shall be a subject for discussion at such conference between the heads of state."

I wish it clearly understood that my fundamental objections to the Big Four meeting stand, for the reasons set forth in my Senate

speech of last Thursday. However, the preparations for the meeting are proceeding. I believe the Senate has the responsibility of seeing to it—so far as it is within its powers to do so—that the meeting take the shape that, in the Senate's judgment, it ought to take, and that the American delegation strive for the objectives that, in the Senate's judgment, it ought to strive for.

I was led to believe from the tenor of last Thursday's debate that it is definitely the Senate's judgment that the question of the Communist satellite countries should be discussed. The Senators seemed to agree with me that it was not desirable to talk only about what we might give away instead of what we might get.

My position was that the satellite countries would not be discussed, and for two reasons: No. 1, that the nature of the struggle between the Communists, whose goal is world conquest, and the free world, whose present goal is to live peacefully, side by side, with communism, is such that the only negotiable areas of the world are the frontier areas of the free world; and No. 2, that the Communists have plainly said on three occasions in the last month that they would not discuss the satellite nations.

Other Senators, notably the minority leader, took exception to this view. Senator KNOWLAND seemed to imply that the meeting would be unwise, in his judgment, if a discussion of the satellite countries did not take place. But he believed we would be able to force the Communists to discuss the question. I think this resolution, if heeded by the Secretary of State, will prove which view was correct.

I know the minority leader feels as strongly as I do that discussion of the satellite countries is an imperative for the Big Four talks. I know he feels as strongly as I that we should talk not about what we may give away, but what the free world may get. I hope he will see in this resolution an opportunity to firm up his position.

I do not believe anyone can seriously maintain that there will be actual negotiations about the satellite countries if an agreement is not reached in advance to include this item on the Geneva agenda. If the President starts talking about the satellite countries without such prior understanding, the Kremlin leaders will simply not listen.

Some Senators have said we will be able to score a propaganda victory by putting the Communists on the spot at Geneva. I believe if the Senators who make it will think this argument through, they will see that such hopes are illusory.

The Communists have given fair warning, far in advance of the conference, that they will not discuss the satellite countries. Therefore, and let's face it: the Communists have already put us on the spot. I say we should call their bluff—if bluff is what it really is. If we do not call their bluff, then we will have no standing to complain at the conference that the Soviet Union will not talk about the satellite countries. If Mr. Dulles comes away from San Francisco without an advance agreement, and if the President arrives in Geneva without it, the world will assume there is a tacit understanding between the Soviets and ourselves not to discuss the issue. And we certainly will not be in a position to score the propaganda touchdown some of the Senators seem to anticipate.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I had promised to yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], to permit him to make a statement or to submit a request.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much, but I shall wait until tomorrow.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 21, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 20, 1955:

UNITED NATIONS

John C. Baker, of Ohio, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Naitons, vice Preston Hotchkis, resigned.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be general

Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway, O5264, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army).

To be lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. Alexander Russell Bolling, O7548, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Claude Birkett Ferenbaugh, O12479, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 20, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Robert E. Lee, pastor, St. Luke Evangelical Lutheran Church, Silver Spring, Md., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of us all—who knowest the motives of men and of nations—make Thy presence known, once more, to these men and women as they commence another week in service to Thee and to our Nation.

Protect and lead them as they go about their many duties and grant to us all moral courage stronger than the evil which is loose in the world. This we pray through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 16, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 208. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas and Oklahoma to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States;

H. R. 2984. An act authorizing E. B. Reyna, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Los Ebanos, Tex.;

H. R. 3878. An act to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended, pertaining to emergency flood-control work;

H. R. 4426. An act to amend section 7 of the act approved September 22, 1922, as amended;

H. R. 4573. An act authorizing Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 5188. An act to prohibit publication by the Government of the United States of any prediction with respect to apple prices;

H. R. 5841. An act to repeal the fee-stamp requirement in the Foreign Service and amend section 1728 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

H. R. 5842. An act to repeal a service charge of 10 cents per sheet of 100 words, for making out and authenticating copies of records in the Department of State;

H. R. 5860. An act to authorize certain officers and employees of the Department of State and the Foreign Service to carry firearms;

H. R. 6410. An act to authorize the construction of a building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution, including the preparation of plans and specifications, and all other work incidental thereto; and

H. Con. Res. 157. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the desire of the American people for peace.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5923. An act to authorize certain sums to be appropriated immediately for the completion of the construction of the Inter-American Highway.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 847. An act to authorize the construction of two surveying ships for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce, and for other purposes;

S. 890. An act to strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act;

S. 1400. An act to protect the integrity of grade certificates under the United States Grain Standards Act;

S. 1472. An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to desert-land entrymen to the same extent as such assistance is available to homestead entrymen;

S. 1550. An act authorizing the State Highway Commission of the State of Maine to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the St. Croix River between Calais, Maine, and St. Stephen, New Brunswick, Canada;

S. 1757. An act to amend the act known as the "Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946," approved August 14, 1946;

S. 1759. An act to consolidate the Hatch Act of 1887 and laws supplementary thereto relating to the appropriation of Federal funds for the support of agricultural experiment stations in the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico;

S. 1966. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing of documents evidencing the lease, mortgage, conditional sale, or bailment of motor vehicles sold to or owned by certain carriers subject to such act;

S. 2097. An act to authorize the transfer to the Department of Agriculture, for agricultural purposes, of certain real property in St. Croix, V. I.;

S. 2098. An act to amend Public Law 83, 83d Congress;

S. 2237. An act to amend the act of May 26, 1949, to strengthen and improve the organization of the Department of State, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution to modify the authorized project for Ferrells Bridge Reservoir, Tex., and to provide for the local cash contribution for the water-supply feature of that reservoir; and

S. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution to authorize the enrollment with certain changes of Senate Joint Resolution 62, dedicating the Lee Mansion in Arlington National Cemetery as a permanent memorial to Robert E. Lee.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution dedicating the Lee Mansion in Arlington National Cemetery as a permanent memorial to Robert E. Lee.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3005. An act to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. BRIDGES to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6367. An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. THYE, and Mr. POTTER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 103. An act to provide for the construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects by irrigation districts and other public agencies; and

H. R. 2126. An act to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters.

1955 AMENDMENTS TO THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3005) to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VINSON, BROOKS of Louisiana, KILDAY, SHORT, and ARENDS.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES RATE A PAY PROMOTION

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Federal employees are not only civil servants of the American public.

They give indispensable assistance to every Member of Congress.

It would be unfortunate, on our part, if we "took them for granted."

For many years it was assumed that, as soon as a person acquired civil-service status in one of the regular agencies of the United States Government, we could forget about him, or her.

What more could a person want than job security, in an age where security is supposed to be the answer to all economic problems?

No layoffs.

No part-time work.

Steady, for 30 or 40 or 50 years, with the presentation of a watch at the end of the trail.

"What more could these permanent status Federal employees expect than a guaranteed lifetime wage?" was the comment of a few cynics.

Forgetting that it was a permanent income for some, and a living income for none.

The static salaries of Federal employees fell behind the rising cost of living, and the improving wage standards of their fellow Americans in private enterprise.

Something was wrong with the job-security formula, even for those who were not affected by reductions in force.

The morale of Federal employees slipped, noticeably.

The job-turnover rate reached alarming proportions.

Even Presidents of the United States took time out to wonder why Federal employees were no longer satisfied with their work, and to consider ways and means of providing the incentives that would hold experienced and trusted employees whose places could be filled only at considerable cost and inconvenience, if ever.

To work on a treadmill that causes a person to lose ground no matter how hard he tries to advance is no encouragement for a person to remain in the Federal service.

Private industry, on the other hand, is quick to notice ability, and to reward it, voluntarily.

Federal employees, however, have had to wage an uphill fight, and over a long period of time, to awaken those who control the purse-strings that Government workers are also human beings who must be able to make both ends meet if they are to do their best work.

For the past year and a half we have seen this vital issue kicked around for political advantage.

This has not fooled the Government workers for 1 minute.

If anything, it has added to their discontent.

The time has come, therefore, for the Congress to pass a genuine pay increase bill, and by a unanimous vote, if the harm that has been done to the morale of Federal employees is to be repaired.

We have established a precedent in our own case by raising our own salaries generously.

We have increased the pay of career personnel in the Armed Forces.

We have made it possible for letter carriers and postal clerks to earn well over $4,000 a year.

The 1,073,262 Federal employees come last, but their arguments are now the strongest.

There is no doubt whatever that they have earned and will get an upward pay adjustment.

The only question is, "How much?"

The Senate has voted 10 percent.

The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has recommended 7½ percent.

The bill to increase postal salaries has already become law, and dissatisfaction is already apparent with its two-installment increase to 8.2 percent, with proportionately higher percentage increases for those in the upper brackets.

I suggest that we do not write similar irritations into the Federal employees pay raise bill.

An across-the-board boost would be fair to all.

Personally, I believe that a 10-percent raise would not be too much.

But, whatever this House does decide, I hope that it will overwhelmingly endorse a substantial and long-overdue salary increase for all Federal workers today.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 40 minutes today, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders hereto entered, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

CONGRESSIONAL SECRETARIES' SHOW

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and to include the program of the congressional secrearies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, during the past week all of us have had an opportunity to study the "flyer" I hold in my hand—as they sometimes say in Nebraska—and our attention has been drawn by the big black letters which read—"Now Hear This." It carries the news that our secretaries, who have been rehearsing for 6 weeks to present their annual variety show, Revisin' and Extendin', will donate the proceeds to a critically needed clinic for retarded children. In years past our secretaries have presented Revisin' and Extendin'—without unanimous consent—solely for the entertainment of the Members of the House and Senate and their families. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that this, the first benefit ever launched by the Congressional Secretaries' Club has been arranged during the administration of my secretary, Miss Marie Warme, who is president of the club this year. I want to urge that every Member of this House help the Congressional Secretaries' Club, the Greater Washington Council for Retarded Children—an association of parents of retarded children—and HELP—Help Exceptional Little People—an association which aids them—establish this medical center. Georgetown Hospital will provide a staff of doctors, nurses, and space for the clinic. We Members of the House should be more than willing to help our secretaries in this effort to equip this sorely needed diagnostic and treatment center.

You know, Mr. Speaker, a secretary's greatest attribute—particularly a secretary to a Member of Congress—is loyalty. Let us show our hardworking, loyal secretaries that we realize that loyalty is not a one-way street. Let us show them that we appreciate their attitude toward us and our interests and that we are proud and glad to help them in this worthwhile endeavor. If you have not bought your tickets, please step down to the House Restaurant now and make your purchase. Revisin' and Extendin', 1955, will be presented tomorrow night at 8:30 in the beautiful new ballroom at the Sheraton Park Hotel. Let us all be there.

NOW HEAR THIS!

Get your tickets for Revisin' and Extendin', '55, the congressional secretaries' annual variety show. Here is your chance to get the secretaries' eyeview of Capitol Hill.

Where? The beautiful new million-dollar ballroom, Sheraton Park Hotel. (It's worth the price of admission just to see the place.)

When? June 21 at 8:30 p. m.

Why? Because you are guaranteed a rollicking evening but more important because the net proceeds of Revisin' and Extendin', '55, will help establish a clinic for retarded children. There is no diagnostic or treatment center for the approximately 3,000 mentally retarded children in the metropolitan area (District of Columbia, Virginia, and Maryland). Many of these little children have been unnecessarily committed to institutions or are hidden and unknown to medical and educational authorities. The critical need for this clinic is manifest. Please help the Congressional Secretaries' Club, the Greater Washington Council for Retarded Children (an association of parents of retarded children) and HELP (Help Exceptional Little People—an association which aids them) establish this medical center. Georgetown Hospital will provide a staff, nurses, and space for the clinic. Won't you help to equip it?

How much? Three dollars for any seat in the house. Knowing you helped establish this clinic will be a source of great satisfaction to you. It will be the first clinic for retarded children in America.

Get your tickets now! Get your tickets now! Get your tickets now!

Sponsors: $25 for 2 tickets. Patrons: $10 for 2 tickets.

Send your check to Ticket Chairman, Variety Show, No. 326, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COME OUT! COME OUT! WHEREVER YOU ARE!

See Revisin' and Extendin', '55, third edition, congressional secretaries' annual variety show.

You will see 16 gorgeous congressional chorines.

You will hear the lowdown on Revisin' and Extendin' without unanimous consent.

You will see a subcommittee on appropriations under investigation.

You will hear these statesmen talk their way out of this new switch.

You will see what happens to a G. C. (grateful constituent).

You will hear the terrific entertainers in the Sheik of Araby Restaurant.

You will see Firefly. Spectacular Firefly, the gal in flames!

You will hear Raoul Dedwood pilot a secretary through the rigors of congressional employment in "This Was Your Strife" (no apologies to Ralph Edwards).

You will see and hear all this and more, too, in Capitol Hill's colossal, spectacular Revisin' and Extendin', '55.

Tickets at Talbert's Agency, Willard Hotel; Congressional Hotel; Washington and Silver Spring Hecht Co. stores; or phone National 8-3120, extensions 613, 224, 1459, and 567.

Get your tickets now.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. After Revisin' and Extendin' was presented last year, I had the pleasure of announcing to the House that members of the cast would appear on a Columbia Broadcasting System network television show. I am happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that the National Broadcasting Co. will use parts of this year's show on Today, the Dave Garroway show, tomorrow morning at 8:45. In view of the great interest last year's CBS TV show created throughout the country, I am sure Members of the House will want to remain at home until 8:45 tomorrow morning to see this year's TV presentation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman for calling the attention of the Members of the House to this show to be given tomorrow night. It is for a worthy cause and I hope the Members will attend.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The show will be at the Sheraton Park Hotel at 8:30 tomorrow evening.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

UTILIZATION OF SALINE WATER

Mr. ENGLE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2126), an act to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research, development, and utilization of saline water.

TO PROVIDE FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM OF AUTHORIZED FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECTS

Mr. ENGLE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 103) to provide for the construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects by irrigation districts and other public agencies.

ARMY RESERVE LEGISLATION

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, anr to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I am in full accord with the views of those people who feel—and many Members of Congress have told me that they feel that way—that we should try to revive the Reserve legislation which came before the House of Representatives several weeks ago. It is my hope that the Committee on Armed Services will shortly meet and report out a watered-down version of that measure, but a version of the bill that will give full and ample authority to the Defense Department to properly and efficiently handle the work of training our military Reserves.

I hope that this bill can come out and be passed without any opposition.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day.

The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

SPECIAL PENSION TO CERTAIN PERSONS AWARDED THE MEDAL OF HONOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 735) to increase the rate of special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice. I understand a rule has been granted, and it has been programed for this week.

The SPEAKER. There will be a suspension on this bill this afternoon. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION TO ATTEND NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Con. Res. 109) authorizing the appointment of a congressional delegation to attend the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INCREASING FEE FOR EXECUTING APPLICATION FOR PASSPORT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5844) to increase the fee for executing an application for a passport from $1 to $3.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5166) relating to a constitutional convention in Alaska.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. FORD, and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin objected, and the bill, under the rule, was stricken from the calendar.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMY AND AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5652) to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army and Air Force, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That commissioned officers of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force (except those appointed pursuant to the act of December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663)), as amended, who, subsequent to August 31, 1946, and prior to the date of enactment of this act, were absent from duty by authority of the Secretary concerned for any period after their acceptance of appointment as a commissioned officer of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force during which period they were awaiting orders assigning them to their initial-duty stations, shall, if application therefor is made within 2 years after the date of enactment of this act and to the extent they have not already been paid therefor, be paid pay and allowances for that period. Payments of pay and allowances heretofore made to these officers for such periods shall be validated upon a determination by the Secretary concerned, or his designee, that such payments were free from fraud and collusion.

SEC. 2. Any commissioned officer or former commissioned officer of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force who has repaid the United States an amount paid to him as pay and allowances for a period described in the first section of this act, is entitled to be paid the amount involved, if otherwise proper, under this act.

SEC. 3. The Comptroller General of the United States, or his designee, shall, within 2 years from the date of this act, relieve disbursing officers, including special disbursing agents, of the Army and the Air Force from accountability or responsibility for any payments described in this act, and shall allow credits in the settlement of the accounts of such officers or agents for payments which are determined by the Secretary concerned, or his designee, to be free from fraud or collusion. The determination by the Secretary concerned, or his designee, shall be final and conclusive upon the Comptroller General: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to original payments authorized by the first section of this act or to the repayments authorized by section 2 hereof.

SEC. 4. Any appropriations available to the military department concerned for the pay and allowances of military personnel are available for payments under this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXECUTION OF MORTGAGES AND DEEDS OF TRUST ON INDIVIDUAL INDIAN TRUST

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4802) to authorize the execution of mortgages and deeds of trust on individual Indian trust or restricted land.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the individual Indian owners of any land which either is held by the United States in trust for them or is subject to a restriction against alienation imposed by the United States are authorized, subject to approval by the Secretary of the Interior, to execute a mortgage or deed of trust to such land. Such land shall be subject to foreclosure or sale pursuant to the terms of such mortgage or deed of trust in accordance with the laws of the State or Territory in which the land is located. For the purpose of any foreclosure or sale proceeding the Indian owners shall be regarded as vested with an unrestricted fee simple title to the land, the United States shall not be a necessary party to the proceeding, and any conveyance of the land pursuant to the proceeding shall divest the United States of title to the land. All mortgages and deeds of trust to such land heretofore approved by the Secretary of the Interior are ratified and confirmed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIMPLIFIED MAILINGS OF CHURCH PUBLICATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4585) to amend the act of August 24, 1912, to simplify the procedures governing the mailings of certain publications of churches and church organizations.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the ninth paragraph under the heading "Office of the Third Assistant Postmaster General" contained in the first section of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1912 (39 U. S. C., sec. 229), is amended—

(1) by inserting "or by a church or church organization," immediately after "or by a regularly established State institution of learning supported in whole or in part by public taxation,";

(2) by inserting "or by churches and church organizations," immediately after "and such periodical publications, issued by or under the auspices of benevolent or fraternal societies or orders or trades unions, or by strictly professional, literary, historical, or scientific societies,";

(3) by inserting "churches and church organizations," immediately after "whether such matter pertains to such benevolent or fraternal societies or orders, trades unions, strictly professional, literary, historical, or scientific societies,";

(4) by inserting "churches and church organizations," immediately after "to further the objects and purposes of such benevolent or fraternal societies or orders, trades unions,"; and

(5) by inserting "or by churches and church organizations" immediately after "circulation through the mails of periodical publications issued by, or under the auspices of, benevolent or fraternal societies or orders, or trades unions, or by strictly professional, literary, historical, or scientific societies,".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month following the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSMISSION OF KEYS AND IDENTIFICATION DEVICES THROUGH THE MAILS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4808) to provide for transmission through the mails of keys and identification cards.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act fixing postage rates on hotel and steamship room keys and tags," approved July 3, 1926 (44 Stat. 890; ch. 778; 39 U. S. C., sec. 302), is amended to read as follows: "That keys or identification cards bearing an explicit post office address, and instructions directing that, if found, such keys or cards be returned to such address and guaranteeing payment of postage on delivery, the rate shall be 5 cents for each 2 ounces or fraction thereof."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That any key, any identification card, identification tag, or similar identification

device, and any other small article which the Postmaster General by regulation may designate, which bears, contains, or has attached securely thereto—

"(1) a complete, definite, and legible post office address, including (if such exists) the street address or box or route number, and

(2) a notice directing that such key, card, tag, device, or small article be returned to such address, and guaranteeing the payment, on delivery, of the postage due thereon,

may be transmitted through the mails to such address at a rate of postage of 5 cents for each 2 ounces or fraction thereof.

"SEC. 2. The act entitled 'An act fixing postage rates on hotel and steamship room keys and tags', approved July 3, 1926 (44 Stat. 890; 39 U. S. C., sec. 302), is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on the 60th day following the date of its enactment."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill was amended to read: "A bill to authorize the transmission through the mails of certain keys, identification devices, and small articles, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MULTIPLE USE OF SURFACE OF PUBLIC LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5891) to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681) and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I understand this bill is to come up under a suspension of the rules. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AMENDING FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3758) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the report accompanying this bill does not comply with the Ramseyer rule I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

INCREASE IN SUBSISTENCE AND TRAVEL EXPENSES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6295) to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1939, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I understand this bill is scheduled for consideration under suspension of the rules. I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

SHIPMENT BY MAIL OF LIVE SCORPIONS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 35) to permit the transportation in the mails of live scorpions.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1716 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after the second paragraph thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"The Posmaster General shall permit the transmission in the mails of live scorpions to be used for medical research work under such regulations as he may prescribe with respect to the packaging of such scorpions as will give adequate protection to postal personnel and make for ease of handling by the research worker."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 1716 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting immediately after the second paragraph thereof the following new paragraph:

" 'The Postmaster General is authorized and directed to permit the transmission in the mails, under regulations to be prescribed by him, of live scorpions which are to be used for purposes of medical research or for the manufacture of antivenin. Such regulations shall include such provisions with respect to the packaging of such live scorpions for transmission in the mails as the Postmaster General deems necessary or advisable for the protection of Post Office Department personnel and of the public generally and for ease of handling by such personnel and by any individual connected with such research or manufacture. Nothing contained in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the transmission in the mails of live scorpions by means of aircraft engaged in the carriage of passengers for compensation or hire.' "

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill was amended to read: "A bill to provide for the transmission in the mails of live scorpions."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SPECIAL CANCELING STAMP BEARING THE WORDS "PRAY FOR PEACE"

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 692) to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for peace."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Postmaster General to grant permission to use special canceling stamps or postmarking dies," approved May 11, 1922 (39 U. S. C., sec. 368), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) Any permission granted by the Postmaster General under the first section of this act shall be revocable in the event the Government shall find it expedient or necessary to use special canceling stamps or postmarking dies for its own purposes.

"(b) The Postmaster General is authorized to provide for the use in each first- and second-class post office, of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for peace."

SEC. 2. The second proviso in the first section of such act of May 11, 1922, is amended by striking out "nothing in this act" and inserting in lieu thereof "nothing in this section".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the action today by the House in unanimously passing my pray-for-peace bill gives me a great deal of satisfaction. The measure, H. R. 692, authorizes the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for peace." Last year an identical bill introduced by me was also passed in the House but the Congress adjourned 2 days later before the Senate could consider the measure. It is my hope that the bill, H. R. 692, that passed in the House today will receive early approval in the Senate so that soon it may be enacted into law—that the United States mail delivered here and abroad to the far corners of the earth may manifest to all the world the exhortation of our great country to peoples everywhere—to raise their minds and hearts to the Supreme Creator of the universe and pray for peace.

RECORDATION OF SCRIP, LIEU SELECTION, AND SIMILAR RIGHTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2972) to require the recordation of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any owner of, and any person claiming rights to, Valentine scrip, issued under the act of April 5, 1872 (17 Stat. 649); Sioux Half-Breed scrip, issued under the act of July 17, 1854 (10 Stat. 304); Supreme Court scrip, issued under the acts of June 22, 1860 (12 Stat. 85), March 2, 1867 (14 Stat. 544), and June 10, 1872 (17 Stat. 378); Surveyor General scrip, issued under the act of June 2, 1858 (11 Stat. 294); a soldier's additional homestead right, granted by sections 2306 and 2307 of the Revised Statutes; a forest lieu selection right, assertable under the act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1264); a lieu selection right conferred by the

act of July 1, 1898 (30 Stat. 597); a bounty land warrant issued under the act of March 3, 1855 (10 Stat. 701); or any lieu selection or scrip right or bounty land warrant, or right in the nature of scrip issued under any act of Congress not enumerated herein (except the indemnity selection rights of any State, or the Territory of Alaska), shall, within 3 years from the effective date of this act, present his holdings or claim for recordation by the Department of the Interior.

SEC. 2. In the case of a transfer after the effective date of this act, by assignment, inheritance, operation of law, or otherwise of a holding or claim of any right recorded under this act, the holding or claim of right so transferred shall be presented to the Department of the Interior within 6 months after such transfer, for recordation by it; except that where such transfer occurs within the period of 3 years from the effective date of this act and the prior owner has not complied with provisions of this act, the owner or claimant by transfer shall have the remainder of such period or a period of 6 months, whichever is the longer, within which to present his claims or holdings for recordation.

SEC. 3. There shall be endorsed on the evidence of the right or warrant each recordation thereof.

SEC. 4. Claims or holdings not presented for recordation as prescribed herein, shall not thereafter be accepted by the Secretary of the Interior for recordation or as a basis for the acquisition of lands.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MANAGEMENT AND DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC DOMAIN LANDS IN OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4001) to provide for the management and disposition of certain public domain lands in the State of Oklahoma.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to provide, in accordance with the terms of this act, for the management and disposition of any interest of the United States in those lands which were reconvened to the United States by deeds of conveyance executed on November 29, 1950, by the principal chief of the Choctaw Nation and the governor of the Chickasaw Nation, or which have been, or may be, reconveyed to the United States by any further and supplemental conveyances made under the authority of the Interior Department Appropriation Act of June 28, 1944 (58 Stat. 463, 483), the joint resolution of June 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 596), and the First Deficiency Appropriation Act of May 24, 1949 (63 Stat. 76, 84.)

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior, in order to facilitate the administration and management of the lands, to remove any clouds on the titles of any persons to interests in such lands, or to establish definite boundaries for such lands, may (1) sell any tract of lands at public sale to the highest responsible bidder, or at private sale; (2) exchange any tract of such lands for other lands or mineral deposits of approximately equal aggregate value; or (3) relinquish any tract of such lands, with or without compensation, to any person having a legal or equitable interest therein. In passing upon a proposed disposition of any tract of land under this subsection, the Secretary shall take into account the uses to which the tract involved is most suited and whether it may be better utilized in private ownership.

(b) In selling any tract under subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall make such provision as he may deem appropriate to give a preference right to any occupant of the tract who has, or whose predecessors in interest have, lawfully and continuously occupied the tract for home, business, or school purposes since April 30, 1949, or earlier. The Secretary shall give any occupant who is lawfully in possession of a tract at the time of its offer for sale, an appropriate period within which such occupant may remove improvements constructed by him or by his predecessors in interest, or may elect to receive compensation for such improvements from the successful purchaser of the tract in an amount equal to the appraised value of the improvements as determined by the Secretary.

(c) In disposing of an interest in any tract under this act, the Secretary may also give a preference right, when he deems it appropriate, to any owner of an interest in any land adjoining the tract to be disposed.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary may sell or lease any tract under the provisions of the act of June 4, 1954 (68 Stat. 173; 43 U. S. C., sec. 869, and the following), to the State of Oklahoma or any other agency or organization qualified under that act.

(b) Upon the filing of an application by an appropriate local governing body within 2 years after the first issuance of regulations under this act, the Secretary of the Interior may relinquish or convey to such body, without compensation, any tract of the lands which, prior to the transfer of title to the United States, was set apart for streets, alleys, or other public purposes, even though not legally dedicated to such purposes.

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall issue quitclaim deeds for any lands disposed of under section 2 or section 3 (b) of this act. The Secretary shall fix through appraisal the minimum price to be paid for lands that are offered for sale under subsection (a) (1) of section 2. If any lands are relinquished under subsection (a) (3) of section 2, without compensation, the Secretary shall require the grantee to pay a service charge of not less than $10.

(b) Any deed for lands disposed of under section 2 of this act which are withdrawn, classified, or valuable for mineral deposits shall contain a reservation to the United States of such mineral deposits, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under applicable provisions of law, but this requirement may be waived by the Secretary in connection with any disposition under subsection (a) (3) of section 2. Any deed for lands disposed of under this act shall contain any provision which the Secretary determines is necessary in order to protect the rights of the holders of existing interests in the lands, or to permit access to any of the lands in which the Federal Government retains an interest.

(c) If a survey is necessary to describe properly any lands that are to be disposed of under this act, the Secretary shall require the proposed grantee to pay the proportionate cost of such survey.

(d) Any lands or mineral deposits acquired by the United States in an exchange under this act shall be subject to the same provisions of law as the public lands for which they were exchanged.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior may issue easements, leases, or permits for the development and use of nonmineral resources of the lands or may sell such resources.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior may accept contributions or donations of money, services, and property to further the provisions of this act. Moneys received under this section shall be covered into the Treasury and are hereby appropriated and made available until expended, as the Secretary may direct, for payment of expenses incident to the function toward the administration of which the contributions were made and for refunds to contributors of amounts contributed by them in excess of their appropriate share of such expenses, as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Interior may issue such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this act, including regulations providing for the protection of the surface and other nonmineral values of lands disposed of under this act whenever any mineral rights reserved to the United States are exercised by it or under its authority.

SEC. 8. All moneys realized under the provisions of this act, except moneys received under the provisions of section 6, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 10, preceding the numeral 2, insert the word "or."

Page 2, strike all of lines 11 and 12.

Page 3, line 22, preceding the words "any tract", insert the words "the surface rights to."

Page 4, lines 11 and 12, strike the words "which are withdrawn, classified, or valuable for mineral deposits."

Page 4, line 13, strike the word "such" and insert in lieu thereof the word "all."

Page 4, line 15, insert a period following the word "law" and strike the words ", but this requirement may be waived by the Secretary in connection with any disposition under subsection (a) (3) of section 2."

Page 5, lines 3 to 6 inclusive, strike all of subsection (d).

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REVERSIONARY INTERESTS IN CERTAIN LANDS QUITCLAIMED TO CHANDLER, OKLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4747) to provide that reversionary interests of the United States in certain lands formerly conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., shall be quitclaimed to such city.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to quitclaim to the city of Chandler, Okla., in consideration of the payment of $3,000, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to those lands otherwise conveyed by the United States to such city by the act entitled "An act to grant a military target range of Lincoln County, Okla., to the city of Chandler, Okla., and reserving the right to use for military and aviation purposes," approved February 15, 1923. Such sum of $3,000 shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING SPECIAL LIVESTOCK LOANS FOR 2 YEARS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4915) to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (c) of the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, is further amended by striking the word "two" from the first sentence of said subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "four" and by adding after the first sentence of the said subsection the following new sentence: "After the expiration of the period specified herein, such loans may be made only for supplementary advances to producers indebted for loans made under this subsection."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN RIGHTS-OF-WAY AND TIMBER ACCESS ROADS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4664) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain rights-of-way and timber access roads.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior may acquire rights-of-way and existing connecting roads adjacent to public lands whenever he determines that such acquisition is needed to provide a suitable and adequate system of timber access roads to public lands under his jurisdiction.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this act, the term "public lands" includes the Revested Oregon and California Railroad and the Reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant Lands in Oregon.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1464) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain rights-of-way and timber access roads, a similar though not identical Senate bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, for a period of 5 years after the date of enactment of this act, may acquire rights-of-way and existing connecting roads adjacent to public lands whenever he determines that such acquisition is needed to provide a suitable and adequate system of timber access roads to public lands under his jurisdiction.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this act, the term "public lands" includes the Revested Oregon and California Railroad and the Reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant Lands in Oregon.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Engle: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and substitute the provisions of H. R. 4664, just passed, as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior may acquire rights-of-way and existing connecting roads adjacent to public lands whenever he determines that such acquisition is needed to provide a suitable and adequate system of timber access roads to public lands under his jurisdiction.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this act, the term "public lands" includes the Revested Oregon and California Railroad and the Reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant Lands in Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The proceedings by which H. R. 4664 was passed were vacated, and that bill and a motion to reconsider were laid on the table.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SALARY INCREASE ACT OF 1955

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 67) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 603 (b) and section 603 (c) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (65 Stat. 612; 5 U. S. C., sec. 1113 (b) and (c)), are amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates						
GS-1	$2,690	$2,775	$2,860	$2,945	$3,030	$3,115	$3,200
GS-2	2,955	3,040	3,125	3,210	3,295	3,380	3,465
GS-3	3,170	3,255	3,340	3,425	3,510	3,595	3,680
GS-4	3,415	3,500	3,585	3,670	3,755	3,840	3,925
GS-5	3,665	3,800	3,935	4,070	4,205	4,340	4,475
GS-6	4,080	4,215	4,350	4,485	4,620	4,755	4,890
GS-7	4,520	4,655	4,790	4,925	5,060	5,195	5,330
GS-8	4,965	5,100	5,235	5,370	5,505	5,640	5,775
GS-9	5,440	5,575	5,710	5,845	5,980	6,115	6,250
GS-10	5,915	6,050	6,185	6,320	6,455	6,590	6,725
GS-11	6,385	6,600	6,815	7,030	7,245	7,460	
GS-12	7,570	7,785	8,000	8,215	8,430	8,645	
GS-13	8,985	9,200	9,415	9,630	9,845	10,060	
GS-14	10,320	10,535	10,750	10,965	11,180	11,395	
GS-15	11,610	11,880	12,150	12,420	12,690		
GS-16	12,900	13,115	13,330	13,545	13,760		
GS-17	13,975	14,190	14,405	14,620			
GS-18	14,800						

"(c) (1) The compensation schedule for the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates				
CPC-1	$1,945	$2,010	$2,075	$2,140	$2,205	$2,270	$2,335
CPC-2	2,600	2,675	2,750	2,825	2,900	2,975	3,050
CPC-3	2,745	2,830	2,915	3,000	3,085	3,170	3,255
CPC-4	2,955	3,040	3,125	3,210	3,295	3,380	3,465
CPC-5	3,200	3,285	3,370	3,455	3,540	3,625	3,710
CPC-6	3,440	3,525	3,610	3,695	3,780	3,865	3,950
CPC-7	3,695	3,805	3,915	4,025	4,135	4,245	4,355
CPC-8	4,020	4,155	4,290	4,425	4,560	4,695	4,830
CPC-9	4,460	4,595	4,730	4,865	5,000	5,135	5,270
CPC-10	4,905	5,040	5,175	5,310	5,445	5,580	5,715

"(2) Charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of $2,900 per annum, and head charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of $3,050 per annum."

(b) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom this section applies shall be initially adjusted as follows:

(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the scheduled or longevity rates of a grade in the General Schedule or the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled or longevity rate in effect on and after such date;

(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between two scheduled or two longevity rates, or between a scheduled and a longevity rate, of a grade in the General Schedule or the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date;

(3) If the officer or employee (other than an officer or employee subject to paragraph (4) of this subsection), immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving basic compensation at a rate in excess of the maximum longevity rate of his grade, or in excess of the maximum scheduled rate of his grade if there is no longevity rate for his grade, he shall receive basic compensation at a rate equal to the rate which he received immediately prior to such effective date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this section in the maximum longevity rate, or the maximum scheduled rate, as the case may be, of his grade until (A) he leaves such position, or (B) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; but when such position becomes vacant the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with such act, as amended; or

(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving an existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under section 208 (b) of the act of September 1, 1954 (Public Law 763, 83d Cong.), he shall receive an aggregate rate of compensation equal to such existing aggregate rate, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this section in the maximum longevity rate of his grade until he (A) leaves such position, or (B) is entitled to receive aggregate compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of any other provision of law; but when such position becomes vacant the aggregate rate of compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with applicable provisions of law. For the purposes of section 208 (b) of the act of September 1, 1954 (Public Law 763, 83d Cong.), the amount of such increase shall be held and considered to constitute a part of the existing aggregate rate of compensation of such employee; or

(5) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, was in a position for which the rate of compensation is fixed under section 603 (c) (2) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and at such time he was receiving basic compensation at a rate in excess of the rate provided for his position under such section, he shall receive basic compensation at a rate equal to the rate he was paid immediately prior to such effective date increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this section in the rate for like positions under such section 603 (c) (2) until he leaves such position; but when such position becomes vacant the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with such section.

(c) Each officer or emloyee—

(1) (A) who with his position has been transferred, at any time during the period beginning January 1, 1952, and ending on the date of enactment of this act, from the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule or the General Schedule to a prevailing rate schedule pursuant to the Classification Act of 1949 or title I of the act of September 1, 1954 (Public Law 763, 83d Cong.), or (B) who, at any time during the period beginning on the effective date of this section and ending on the date of enactment of this act, transferred from a position subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to a position subject to a prevailing rate schedule.

(2) Who at all times subsequent to such transfer was in the service of the United States (including the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, without break in such service of more than 30 consecutive calendar days and, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, without break in service in excess of the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

(3) who is on such date of enactment being compensated under a prevailing rate schedule, and

(4) whose rate of basic compensation is less on such date of enactment than the rate to which he would have been entitled on such date of enactment if such transfer had not occurred (unless he is receiving such lesser rate by reason of an adverse personnel action resulting from his own fault),

shall be paid basic compensation at a rate equal to the rate which he would have been receiving on such date of enactment (including compensation for each within-grade and longevity step-increase which he would have earned) if such transfer had not occurred until the day immediately following such date of enactment, for all time in a pay status on and after the effective date of this section in a position subject to a prevailing rate schedule under the circumstances prescribed in this subsection, until (A) he leaves the position which he holds on such date of enactment, or (B) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate under a prevailing rate schedule; but when such position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with prevailing rate schedules.

(d) The rate of basic compensation of each officer or employee who, at any time during the period beginning on the effective date of this section and ending on the date of enactment of this act, became subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, at a rate of basic compensation which was fixed on the basis of a higher previously earned rate or which was established under authority of section 803 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (68 Stat. 1106; 5 U. S. C., sec. 1133), and which is above the minimum rate of the grade of such officer or employee, shall be adjusted, retroactively to the date on which he became subject to such act, on the basis of the rate for that step of the appropriate grade of the appropriate compensation schedule contained in this section which corresponds numerically to the step of the grade of the compensation schedule for such officer or employee which was in effect (without regard to this act) at the time he became subject to the Classification Act of 1949 as in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section.

(e) The last sentence of section 704 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "Notwithstanding subsection (b) (4) of section 703, longevity step increases for grade 15 of the General Schedule shall be the same as those for grade 14 of the General Schedule."

SEC. 3. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision a of section 62 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C., sec. 102 (a) (2)), section 3656 of title 18 of the United States Code, the second and third sentences of section 603, section 604 (a) (5), or sections 672 to 675, inclusive, of title 28 of the United States Code are hereby increased by amounts equal to the increases provided by section 2 of this act in corresponding rates of compensation paid to officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The limitations of $10,560 and $14,355 with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges, contained in the paragraph under the heading "Salaries of supporting personnel" in the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1955 (Public Law 470, 83d Cong.), or in any subsequent appropriation act, shall be increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this act.

(c) Section 753 (e) of title 28 of the United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts) is amended by striking out "$6,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$6,450".

SEC. 4. (a) Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 7.5 percent of the aggregate rate of his rate of basic compensation and the rate of the additional compensation received by him under sections 501 and 502 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, section 301 of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, the provisions under the heading "Increased pay for legislative employees" in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, the act of October 24, 1951 (Public Law 201, 82d Cong.), and any other provision of law.

(b) Section 2 (b) of the act of October 24, 1951 (Public Law 201, 82d Cong.), is amended by striking out "$11,646 per annum unless expressly authorized by law" and inserting in lieu thereof "the highest per annum rate of compensation paid under authority of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, unless expressly authorized by law."

(c) The rates of basic compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives (not including the presiding officers of the two Houses), the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, the Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives, and the Coordinator of Information of the House of Representatives are hereby increased by 7.5 percent.

(d) The limitations in the paragraph designated "Folding documents" under the heading "Contingent Expenses of the House" in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1955 (Public Law 470, 83d Cong.), are hereby increased by 7.5 percent.

SEC. 5. Section 66 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 269) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 66. No director, officer, or employee of the Central Bank for Cooperatives or of any production credit corporation, production credit association, or bank for cooperatives shall be paid compensation at a rate in excess of $14,620 per annum."

SEC. 6. (a) Each of the minimum rates of salary contained in section 3 (d), the maximum rate of salary contained in the second sentence of such section 3 (d), and each of the maximum and minimum rates of salary contained in section 7, of the act of January 3, 1946 (Public Law 293, 79th Cong.), as amended (38 U. S. C., secs. 15b (d) and 15f (a)), are hereby increased by 7.5 percent.

(b) Each of the rates of salary contained in section 3 (e) and section 3 (f) of such act of January 3, 1946, as amended (38 U. S. C., secs. 15b (e) and (f)), is hereby increased by 7.5 percent.

(c) Each of the rates of salary increased by subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be rounded, as so increased, to the nearest $5 per annum, counting $2.50 per annum and over as $5 per annum.

(d) Section 8 (d) of such act of January 3, 1946, as amended (38 U. S. C., sec. 15g (d)), is amended by striking out "$12,800" and inserting in lieu thereof "$13,760."

SEC. 7. Each of the rates of basic compensation provided by sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is hereby increased by 7.5 percent. Each such rate as so increased shall be rounded to the nearest $5 per annum, counting $2.50 per annum and over as $5 per annum.

SEC. 8. (a) Notwithstanding section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C., sec. 665), the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the municipal government of the District of Columbia whose rates of compensation are fixed by administrative action pursuant to law and are not otherwise increased by this act are hereby authorized to be increased, effective on or after the first day of the first pay period which began after February 28, 1955, by amounts not to exceed the increases provided by this act for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

(b) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to authorize any increase in the rates of compensation of officers and employees whose rates of compensation are fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates or practices.

(c) Nothing contained in this section shall affect the authority contained in any law pursuant to which rates of compensation may be fixed by administrative action.

SEC. 9. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, (1) no rate of compensation or salary which is $14,800 or more per annum shall be increased by reason of this act and (2) no rate of compensation or salary shall be increased by reason of this act to an amount in excess of $14,800 per annum.

SEC. 10. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to an officer or employee who retired during the

period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began after February 28, 1955, and ending on the date of enactment of this act for services rendered during such period and (2) in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 636, 81st Congress), as amended, for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began after February 28, 1955, and ending on the date of enactment of this act by an officer or employee who dies during such period.

(b) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 11. Notwithstanding any provision of this act or of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, no individual subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, whose rate of basic salary is increased by reason of section 701 of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, shall be entitled to receive payment of any increase under the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended by this act, for any period for which he is entitled to receive an increase in basic salary under section 701 of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955.

SEC. 12. (a) Section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (68 Stat. 1105; 5 U. S. C., sec. 1105), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 505. (a) No position shall be placed in grade 16, 17, or 18 of the General Schedule except by action of, or after prior approval by a majority of the Civil Service Commissioners.

"(b) Subject to subsections (c), (d), and (e) of this section, a majority of the Civil Service Commissioners are authorized to establish and, from time to time, revise the maximum number of positions (not to exceed 1,200) which may be in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule at any one time, except that under such authority such maximum number of positions shall not exceed 325 for grade 17 and 125 for grade 18. The United States Civil Service Commission shall report annually to the Congress the total number of positions established under this subsection for grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule and the total number of positions so established for each such grade.

"(c) The number of positions of senior specialists in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress allocated to grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule by reason of the proviso contained in section 203 (b) (1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 836; 2 U. S. C., sec. 166 (b) (1)) shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grades by subsection (b).

"(d) The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized, subject to the procedures prescribed by this section, to place a total of 25 positions in the General Accounting Office in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grades by subsection (b).

"(e) The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, is authorized, without regard to any other provision in this section, to place a total of 37 positions in the Federal Bureau of Investigation in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grades by subsection (b)."

(b) Positions in grades 16, 17, or 18, as the case may be, of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall remain, on and after such effective date, in their respective grades, until other action is taken under the provisions of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 as in effect on and after such effective date.

(c) The following parts of laws and parts of reorganization plans are hereby repealed:

(1) Section 710 (a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 819; 50 App. U. S. C., sec. 2160 (a));

(2) That part of section 401 (a) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 1254; 50 App. U. S. C., sec. 2253 (a)) which reads as follows: "and subject to the standards and procedures of that act, to place not more than 22 positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule established by that act, and any such positions shall be additional to the number authorized by section 505 of that act;";

(3) Section 108 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (64 Stat. 1064; Public Law 843, 81st Cong.);

(4) The fourth paragraph under the heading "General Accounting Office" contained in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952 (65 Stat. 274; Public Law 137, 82d Cong.), as amended by the fourth paragraph under the heading "General Accounting Office" contained in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953 (66 Stat. 399; Public Law 455, 82d Cong.), and by the proviso under the heading "General Accounting Office" contained in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 280; Public Law 428, 83d Cong.; 31 U. S. C., sec. 52a), which reads as follows: "The Comptroller General of the United States hereafter is authorized, subject to the procedures prescribed by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, but without regard to the numerical limitations contained therein, to place 5 positions in grade GS–18, 2 positions in grade GS–17, and 12 positions in grade GS–16 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, and such positions shall be in lieu of any positions in the General Accounting Office previously allocated under section 505. The authority granted herein shall not be construed to require or preclude the reallocation of any positions in the General Accounting Office previously allocated under section 505.";

(5) That part of the paragraph under the heading "Renegotiation Board" and under the subheading "Salaries and Expenses" contained in chapter V of the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952 (65 Stat. 763; Public Law 254, 82d Cong.; 50 App. U. S. C., sec. 1217a), which reads as follows: ": *Provided*, That the Board is authorized, subject to the procedures prescribed by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, to place not more than 5 positions in grades 16, 17, or 18 of the General Schedule established by said act, and such positions shall be in addition to the number authorized by said section";

(6) That part of section 606 of the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1952 (65 Stat. 600; Public Law 188, 82d Cong.), which reads as follows: "The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place two positions in grade GS–18, and 7 positions in grade GS–17, in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, and such positions shall be in lieu of any positions in the Federal Bureau of Investigation previously allocated under section 505.";

(7) That part of the paragraph under the heading "Federal Bureau of Investigation" and under the subheading "Salaries and Expenses" contained in title II (the Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 1953) of the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1953 (66 Stat. 557; Public Law 495, 82d Cong.; 5 U. S. C., sec. 300e), which reads as follows: ": *Provided further*, That the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation hereafter is authorized, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, to place 20 positions in grade GS–16 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949";

(8) Section 806 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954 (67 Stat. 429; Public Law 207; 83d Cong.);

(9) Section 737 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 357; Public Law 458, 83d Cong.; 5 U. S. C., sec. 171d–2);

(10) That part of the paragraph under the heading "Bureau of the Budget" contained in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 273; Public Law 428; 83d Cong.; 31 U. S. C., sec. 16b), which reads as follows: ": *Provided*, That the Bureau of the Budget is authorized, without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, to place 2 additional positions in grade GS–18 and 2 additional positions in grade GS–17 of the General Schedule established by said act";

(11) That part of the paragraph under the heading "St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation" contained in chapter VIII of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 818; Public Law 663, 83d Cong.; 33 U. S. C., sec. 984a), which reads as follows: "; and the Administrator is authorized, subject to the procedures prescribed by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, to place not more than 4 positions in grades 16, 17, or 18 of the General Schedule established by said act, and such positions shall be in addition to the number authorized by said section";

(12) That part of the paragraph under the heading "President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization" contained in chapter IV of the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954 (68 Stat. 25; Public Law 304, 83d Cong.), which reads as follows: ": *Provided*, That the committee is authorized, without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, to place 1 position in Grade GS–17 of the General Schedule established by said act";

(13) That part of section 602 (a) of the act entitled "An act to provide for greater stability in agriculture; to augment the marketing and disposal of agricultural products; and for other purposes", approved August 28, 1954 (68 Stat. 908; Public Law 690 83d Cong.; 7 U. S. C., sec. 1762 (a)), which reads as follows: ", and the Secretary of Agriculture may place not to exceed 8 positions in grade 16 and 2 in grade 17 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, in accordance with the standards and procedures of that act and such positions shall be in addition to the number authorized in section 505 of that act";

(14) Section 228 of the National Housing Act (68 Stat. 609; 12 U. S. C., sec. 1702a);

(15) The second paragraph of section 606 of the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1952 (65 Stat. 601; Public Law 188, 82d Cong.; 5 U. S. C., sec. 152c);

(16) That part of the third proviso of the first paragraph under the heading "General Provisions" contained in chapter XI of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952 (66 Stat. 121; Public Law 375, 82d Cong.; 5 U. S. C., secs. 245a, 295b 483–1, 592a–2, 611c), which reads as follows: "shall be placed in the highest grade set forth in the general schedule of such act without regard to section 505 (b) of such act, as amended, and shall be in addition to the number of

positions authorized to be placed in such grade under such section,"; and

(17) That part of the paragraph under the heading "United States section, St. Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers" contained in chapter IX of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954 (68 Stat. 90; Public Law 357, 83d Cong.), which reads as follows: "*Provided*, That, subject to the procedures prescribed by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, but without regard to the numerical limitations contained therein, one position under the United States section of said Joint Board of Engineers may hereafter be placed in grade GS–16 in the General Schedule established by that act:".

(18) That part of section 3 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952, effective March 15, 1952* (66 Stat. 823; 5 U. S. C., sec. 133z–15 note), which reads as follows ", except that the compensation may be fixed without regard to the numerical limitations on positions set forth in section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1105)";

(19) That part of section 4 (a) of Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952, effective July 1, 1952 (66 Stat. 826), which reads as follows: ", except that the compensation for not to exceed 15 such offices at any one time may be fixed without regard to the numerical limitations on positions set forth in section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U. S. C. 1105)"; and

(20) That part of section 1 (d) of Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953, effective August 1, 1953 (67 Stat. 642; 5 U. S. C., sec. 133z–15 note), which reads as follows: ", except that the compensation may be fixed without regard to the numerical limitations on positions set forth in section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1105)".

SEC. 13. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, this act shall take effect as of the first day of the first pay period which began after February 28, 1955.

(b) This section and sections 8, 10, 11, and 12, shall take effect on the date of enactment of this act.

(c) For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, all changes in rates of compensation or salary which results from the enactment of this act shall be held and considered to be effective as of the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of such enactment.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to increase by 7½ percent per annum the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government—excluding employees in the field service of the Post Office Department and so-called wage-board employees and officers included in the present Executive Pay Act.

The salary increases provided in the legislation are permanent, are subject to retirement deductions, and will be taken into consideration in computing overtime and night differential pay, and in determination of group life insurance—and the amount of retirement annuities. The total cost of the pay increases provided for by the legislation will be approximately $326 million annually.

The legislation will increase the annual compensation of approximately 1,073,262 Federal employees in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government. Specifically, these employees are: (a) Employees whose positions are subject to the Classification Act of 1949; (b) officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government; (c) court reporters for Federal district courts; (d) secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges; (e) officers and employees in or under the legislative branch of the Government (including reporters of debates and their employees); (f) elected officers and certain appointive officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives (except the presiding officers); (g) officers and employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration; (h) employees in the Foreign Service of the United States under the Department of State.

The bill will also, first, authorize comparable increases to employees whose salaries are set by administrative action such as employees of the TVA; second, raise the limit on salaries which may be paid to officers and employees of the Central Bank for Cooperatives, or any production credit corporation, production credit association, or bank for cooperatives, to permit giving employees of these organizations raises comparable to those received by other Federal employees under this act; third, make the increases in rates of basic compensation effective retroactive to the beginning of the first pay period commencing after February 28, 1955; fourth, maintain the present ceiling of $14,800 above which no salary may be raised by reason of this enactment; fifth, restrict the salary for employees of the legislative branch, except those whose salaries are specifically set by law, to the same rate as the maximum provided under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; sixth, provide for an adjustment in the salaries of employees transferred from the CPC schedules—crafts, protective custodial—to wage board salary schedules to take into consideration the increases provided under this bill; seventh, provide comparable salary increases for the "savings cases"—those drawing salaries over the top salary rate for their grade; eighth, provide for a proportionate payment of the salary increase due for work performed during the retroactive period to employees who retired or to the estate of employees who died during the retroactive period; and, ninth, consolidate all authority for grades 16, 17, and 18, repeals extraneous laws giving separate authority, and requires allocations and classification of such grade to have the approval of a majority of the Civil Service Commissioners.

Our committee conducted extensive hearings with respect to the problem of granting increases in the compensation of all Federal employees. Testimony was received from the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, and representatives of national employees' organizations. It was unanimously agreed that there was ample justification for an increase in the compensation of Federal employees. The only difference of opinion was regarding the amount of such increase and the formula to be used in applying it to existing pay rates.

The Civil Service Commission sent to the Speaker of the House on January 26, 1955, a draft of legislation which would have provided an average increase of 4.9 percent. Following action on postal employees' pay representing a substantially larger increase for postal employees than originally proposed by the administration, as chairman of the committee, I received a report indicating that a higher increase for classified employees than originally recommended would not be disapproved by the administration.

There is a consensus of opinion that the classified employees should have the same salary increase as that given postal employees by Public Law 68 of this Congress. Under Public Law 68, postal employees received a 6-percent increase of their basic salary, retroactive to March 1, 1955, and within 6 months will receive a salary adjustment upon conversion into new salary schedules amounting on an average to 2.1 percent of payroll. It is recognized by the committee that all postal employees would not receive the total increases in the bill amounting to 8.1 percent. However, it is also pointed out by the committee that some of the increases resulting from conversion into the schedules will result in pay increases not entirely attributable to reclassification.

We received a number of proposals which would have readjusted Federal employees' salaries by schedules providing various rate increases. These rate increases would have varied from 4.9 to 10 percent. As a means of compromise, however, the committee decided to provide a salary increase for all Federal employees under this bill of 7½ percent retroactive to the beginning of the first pay period commencing after February 28, 1955. It was the view of your committee that the 7½-percent increase for Federal employees retroactive for the whole period, that is, from the beginning of the first pay period commencing after February 28, 1955, was a fair and adequate comparison between salary increases given postal employees.

INCREASE IN COST OF LIVING

One of the major factors in recommending the salary increases was the increase in the cost of living. On July 1, 1951, the effective date of the last salary increase, the cost-of-living index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics was 110.9; in April 1955 the index was 114.2. This represents an increase of 3.3 points, or 3 percent. S. 67, as reported by this committee, grants a minimum increase of 7.5 percent to every employee covered in the bill.

While the salary increase of 7½ percent is substantially more than the increase in the rise in the cost of living since the last pay raise, it was the view

of the committee that it was necessary to provide the employees an increase in their real wages and to permit them to enjoy, along with millions of other workers throughout the country, a general rise in their standard of living.

I have heard from representatives of the major Federal employee organizations representing employees whose salaries are raised by this bill. They have expressed themselves as being very pleased with the results of the action taken by our committee represented in this bill. I hope that the House will vote to suspend the rules and pass this bill without any opposition. I hope by that action we will as well end any bickering or action with respect to changing the pay-raise provisions of this bill. I am convinced that we have raised the amount of the increase right to the breaking point. There is no more room for general increases.

I would like to compliment each and every member of our committee for the energy and sincerity of purpose they have shown in approaching this very complicated and controversial problem. There have been differences of opinion, but never a difference of objective—that is, to provide a fair and equitable salary increase for Federal employees generally in the same manner as we have provided a salary increase for postal employees.

On January 1, 1955, the total civilian payroll of this Government was $9,455,000,000. The payroll cost of the postal pay bill, which has been enacted by Congress since that date was $159,194,000. The payroll cost of this bill is $325,598,000. So, when this bill becomes law, the total payroll per year for your civilian employees will be $9,939,782,000. This was more than the entire Federal budget in 1940. For the fiscal year 1940 the Federal budget was $9,062,000,000. So you can see how far we have gone in increasing the payroll of our employees. We must not go any further.

I am hopeful and confident that the President will sign this bill, but I do not believe he will sign a bill that goes any higher in salary increases than this one. I am very hopeful that the Senate will accept the House bill on this matter.

I plead with the House to suspend the rules and pass this bill unanimously.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days we have been presented with a riddle. Here it is: When is 8 percent not 8 percent? Some people would have us believe that 8 percent when applied to the Federal classified employees is 8 percent but when 8 percent is applied to the postal workers it is only 6 percent. That is the sort of answer we have been getting to this riddle from rather important sources and every effort has been made to prove its accuracy.

But, Mr. Speaker, it still doesn't make sense to me and I am sure a lot of my colleagues feel likewise. However we need not be too concerned. We all know that statistics and figures can be compiled to justify a position whatever that position may be. Statistics and figures are very flexible and in the hands of statisticians they have been known to do strange things.

In this particular case they have been used to prove that a 6 percent increase for postal employees plus a 2 percent reclassification increase add up to only 6 percent. Sugar it any way you like and that kind of figuring is tricky mathematics.

The plain and unvarnished fact is that to the average post office worker it comes out 8 percent and that 8 percent is reflected in the pay check he draws each month. And an 8 percent overall pay raise for the classified employee adds up to an equal amount. That is precisely what we have been fighting for—equal treatment for workers in the Government service and that is what I confidently expect will emerge from the conference committee.

I sincerely regret that this bill was brought before the House today under suspension of the rules. I would have much preferred an open rule permitting amendments. That is the democratic way to legislate. In this case I would have been satisfied with a rule that would have permitted one amendment pertaining to the percentage of increase.

Such a rule is particularly desirable in this instance because a motion was made in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to set the percentage rate of increase for the Federal classified workers at 8 percent and a tie vote was recorded on that motion. The vote was 12 to 12. Certainly with such a division we are justified in feeling that this body should have a greater opportunity to register its will in the final decision on this important matter.

I requested, in view of the tie vote in committee, that the distinguished chairman seek a rule permitting an amendment on the percentage increase. My request was rejected. Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, I respect the prerogative of the chairman to bring the bill before the House in any manner he sees fit.

During discussion of the rules suspension in committee—and I am not attempting to commit any of the potential House conferees—it was stated that the bill before us, S. 67, provided for a 10 percent increase for all classified workers and the bill approved by the committee provided a 7½ percent increase. Therefore, it was further stated, the House conferees should have some latitude for compromise with the Senate conferees. Under those circumstances I did not oppose suspension of the rules because it was my impression that the House conferees would be compelled to come to some agreement for a pay raise of at least 8 percent for all classified employees. That was my understanding of the discussion relating to the rules suspension and I am certain a number of my colleagues on the committee also understood that by granting some degree of flexibility the desired objective of 8 percent would be attained in conference concurrence on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, at this point may I return to the matter of what constitutes an 8 percent increase for postal employees. Frankly the subject intrigues me. As I stated previously, it was argued that 2.1 percent of this increase is not an increase—it is only reclassification. When originally presented to Congress it was just a reclassification measure. It provided for no other increase whatever—just reclassification. But that reclassification would have the net effect of a pay increase and throughout consideration of the measure we considered it as something amounting to a total of 8 percent.

In fact the first reference to a 6 percent pay raise for postal workers plus a 2 percent reclassification hike was made only after we started talking about an equal increase for classified employees. This breakdown was obviously concocted in an effort to hold down the percentage of increase for the classified employees. But the argument, Mr. Speaker, is invalid. Practically every postal employee, particularly the carrier with whom we are most familiar, receives a 6 percent across-the-board pay raise and within 5 or 6 months, he will receive another 2 or 2½ percent.

To provide equal treatment for other Federal workers we must provide the same overall percentage increase in the total payroll. We know that throughout the years classified workers have lagged behind the postal workers in percentages of increase. That has been true since 1939. The average increase for classified has been 111 percent since then; the average increase for postal workers including the increase recently voted has been 125 percent. Thus to be fair, we would have to add 14 percent to the classified pay to equalize their compensation for the 1939 to date period.

Mr. Speaker, we are not asking such an increase. We are merely asking an 8-percent increase to bring the classified worker on a current par with the postal worker—that is, for this pay increase only. That is indeed a reasonable request—a request that cannot be denied in fairness to the classified service.

I therefore sincerely hope that the House conferees will yield to the conferees of the other body and agree to a minimum increase of 8 percent. Otherwise I shall feel it my duty to oppose the conference report as vigorously as I possibly can when it comes back to the House for concurrence and I am certain that in this fight I will not be alone.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to second the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia. The bill we have before us is a good bill in practically all respects, but it is deficient in the amount of money. It fails to bring about equality of treatment between the classified employees and the postal field service employees of our Government. It is my conviction that these two large groups of Federal employees should be treated as nearly equal as possible.

The bill we passed after a great deal of wrangling, granting an 8-percent-plus increase to the postal field service employees, represented increased buying

power for each individual where he receives the increased compensation. Granting postal employees 6 percent immediately effective and a readjustment of their classification at some time between now and December, nevertheless, does ultimately give them a percentage of increase which, in a great majority of cases, exceeds 8 percent.

For your information, I will place in the RECORD a complete breakdown of each of the 50 positions in the postal schedule showing quite graphically the percentage they have received. At this time I should like to recite just a few of them.

The mail handler is going to receive a 9.2 increase; the garageman 9.2; the motor-vehicle operator 8.35; the city carrier 8.35; the distribution clerk 8.35; the postmaster in a third-class office 10.5; the tour superintendent 12.5; and the assistant postmaster in a first-class office 27.3. The pattern of increase is almost without exception above 8 percent.

The bill we have before us now provides just 7.5 percent, but 7.5 percent is not enough. It is not enough regardless of any statistics which might be offered indicating that the increase is in excess of the cost-of-living increase. Following is a complete breakdown:

Classification	Proposed level	Number of employees	Present salary	Analysis of S. 2061						
				New salary	Ultimate dollar increase	Ultimate percentage increase	Immediate dollar increase	Immediate percentage increase	Years to reach top grade	Amount of yearly step increases
1. Janitor	1	3,202	$2,870- $3,270	$2,880- $3,480	$210	6.4	$210.00	6.4		$100
2. Elevator operator	2	1,166	2,970- 3,370	3,090- 3,720	350	10.3	245.00	7.2	1	105
3. Order filler	2	212	2,950- 3,430	3,090- 3,720	290	8.4	290.00	8.4		105
4. Clerks, 3d-class, post office	2	19,651	2,770- 3,070	3,090- 3,720	650	21.1	230.00	7.4	4	105
5. Guard	3	650	3,170- 3,570	3,330- 4,020	450	12.6	220.00	6.1	2	115
6. File clerk	3	1,250	3,270- 4,070	3,330- 4,020	−70	17.2				
7. Typist	3	125	3,270- 4,070	3,330- 4,020	−70	17.2				
8. Mail handler	3	25,712	3,170- 3,470	3,330- 4,020	550	15.8	320.00	9.2	2	115
9. Garageman	3	624	3,170- 3,470	3,330- 4,020	550	15.8	320.00	9.2	2	115
10. Special-delivery messenger	4	4,533	3,170- 3,770	3,660- 4,410	640	16.9	265.00	7.0	3	125
11. Motor-vehicle operators	4	4,160	3,270- 4,070	3,660- 4,410	340	8.35	340.00	8.35		125
12. City carriers	4	121,731	3,270- 4,070	3,660- 4,410	340	8.35	340.00	8.35		125
13. Distribution clerk	4	113,890	3,270- 4,070	3,660- 4,410	340	8.35	340.00	8.35		125
14. Window clerks	4	64,750	3,270- 4,070	3,660- 4,410	340	8.35	340.00	8.35		125
15. Automotive mechanics	5	1,192	3,270- 4,070	3,880- 4,630	560	13.7	310.00	7.8	2	125
16. Transfer clerk	5	1,459	3,470- 4,270	3,880- 4,630	360	8.4	360.00	8.4		125
17. Distribution clerk, rural post office	5	17,107	3,470- 4,270	3,880- 4,630	360	8.4	360.00	8.4		125
18. Claims clerk, post office	5	54	3,270- 4,070	3,880- 4,630	560	13.7	260.00	6.3	5	125
19. Postmaster, small 3d-class office	5	162	2,883- 3,645	3,880- 4,630	985	27.7	235.00	6.3	6	125
20. Claims clerk	6	105	3,270- 4,070	4,190- 5,030	960	23.5	260.00	6.3	5	140
21. Postmaster, 3d-class post office	6	8,005	2,883- 4,298	4,190- 5,030	732	16.9	452.00	10.5	2	140
22. Foreman, mails	7	564	4,787- 4,896	4,530- 5,460	564	11.5	409.00	8.3	1	155
23. Postmaster, 3d-class post office	7	1,162	3,781- 4,298	4,530- 5,460	1,162	27.0	387.00	9.0	5	155
24. General foreman, rural post office	8	640	5,114- 5,270	4,890- 5,910	640	12.1	470.00	8.9	1	170
25. Assistant postmaster, 1st-class post office	8	940	4,896- 4,970	4,890- 5,910	940	18.1	430.00	8.4	3	170
26. Postmaster, 2d-class post office	8	840	4,770- 5,070	4,890- 5,910	840	16.5	330.00	6.5	3	170
27. General foreman, mails	9	1,020	5,005- 5,370	5,280- 6,390	1,020	18.9	465.00	8.6	3	185
28. Postmaster, small 1st-class post office	9	2,639	5,370- 5,570	5,280- 6,390	820	14.7	450.00	8.0	2	185
29. Building superintendent	10	7	5,970- 6,270	5,800- 7,000	730	11.6	530.00	8.4	1	200
30. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	10	1,663	5,670- 6,170	5,800- 7,000	830	13.4	430.00	6.9	2	200
31. Tour superintendent	11	175	5,270- 5,670	6,380- 7,700	2,030	35.8	710.00	12.5	6	220
32. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	11	865	6,370- 7,070	6,380- 7,700	630	8.9	630.00	8.9		220
33. Postal inspector	12	385	5,970- 6,770	7,020- 8,460	1,690	24.9	490.00	7.2	6	240
34. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	12	122	6,570- 7,370	7,020- 8,460	1,090	14.7	610.00	8.2	2	240
35. Station superintendent	13	15	6,470	7,730- 9,290	2,820	43.5	1,260.00	19.4	6	260
36. Assistant postmaster, 1st-class post office	13	54	6,070	7,730- 9,290	3,220	53.0	1,660.00	27.3	6	260
37. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	13	120	7,370- 7,770	7,730- 9,290	1,520	19.5	480.00	6.18	4	260
38. Assistant postmaster, 1st-class post office	14	44	6,270- 6,870	8,500- 10,180	3,310	48.1	1,630.00	26.0	6	280
39. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	14	54	7,770- 8,770	8,500- 10,180	1,410	16.0	570.00	6.5	3	280
40. Assistant postmaster, 1st-class post office	15	15	7,070	9,350- 11,150	4,080	57.7	2,280.00	32.2	6	300
41. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	15	34	8,770- 9,770	9,350- 11,150	1,380	14.1	780.00	7.9	2	300
42. General superintendent, Postal Transportation Service Division	16	9	8,470	10,300- 12,100	3,630	42.8	1,830.00	21.6	6	300
43. Assistant postmaster	16	10	7,970- 8,470	10,300- 12,100	3,630	42.8	1,830.00	21.6	6	300
44. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	16	10	10,770	10,300- 12,100	1,330	12.3	730.00	6.7	2	300
45. General superintendent, Postal Transportation Service Division	17	3	8,470	11,400- 13,200	4,730	55.8	2,930.00	34.6	6	300
46. Assistant postmaster, largest 1st-class post office	17	2	8,470	11,400- 13,200	4,730	55.8	2,930.00	34.6	6	300
47. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	17	15	11,770	11,400- 13,200	1,430	12.2	830.00	7.0	2	300
48. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	18	10	12,770- 13,770	12,500- 14,300	530	3.8	826.20	6.0		300
49. Postmaster, largest 1st-class post office	19	2	13,770	13,600- 14,800	1,030	7.5	1,030.00	7.5		300
50. Regional director	20	15	12,000- 12,800	14,800	2,000	15.6	2,000.00	15.6		

NOTE.—The percentage increases and the dollar amounts apply to the employees in the top automatic grades.

We have many factors which have a bearing upon the salaries the Government should pay the people it employs. Within the past few weeks, we have noted a number of increases in one of the largest manufacturing industries in the United States—the automobile industry. There have been reported in the newspapers hundreds and hundreds of instances of individual increases in private employment. These increases, negotiated with the strength of organization, usually follow the need for them. But Federal salary increases, because of the time lag and the difficulty of the Congress to meet the need when it first arises, always follow 2 or 3 years after the salary increase first becomes justified. At no time have we, as I think we should have, taken steps to compensate these people for lost buying power over prolonged periods when their pay has lagged behind the cost of living and lagged behind competitive standards in other governmental units and in private industry. It is my sincere hope that by not opposing this today, the bill can go to conference and that between the 10 percent, which is the position taken by the other body, and the 7½ percent in this bill, we can arrive at an 8 percent average which will deal fairly between two major groups of Federal employees. I would like to point out at this time that these are not the only two groups to whom we have given increased compensation. We have raised the salaries of the Federal judiciary and of the members of the Armed Services. They have all received increases in excess of the percentage proposed here. I think there should be a careful effort on the part of the conferees to deal fairly with these people who are entitled to justice from the Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that this bill has finally been reported out. We are assured that it will pass the House and go to the other body in conference. I believe this is a good bill. I am well aware that we can make figures say almost anything we want them to say. So I am not going to give you my personal opinion, but I would like first of all to turn back to the two reports which were published on the postal pay raise bill, one on the part of the House and the other on the part of the other body. Both these reports stated categorically, and without any ifs, ands or buts that the pay raise bill was giving these employees a minimum raise of 6 percent. I also quote from the

present report on the pending bill, S. 67, as amended by the House:

> There is a consensus of opinion that the classified employees should have the same salary increase as that given postal employees by Public Law 68 of the 84th Congress.

In that, I think we all agree.

The report reads further:

> Under Public Law 68, postal employees received a 6-percent increase of their basic salary, retroactive to March 1, 1955, and within 6 months will receive a salary adjustment upon conversion into new salary schedules amounting on an average to 2.1 percent of payroll. It is recognized by the committee that all postal employees would not receive the total increases in the bill amounting to 8.1 percent.

In the present bill, we are giving the classified employees 7.5 percent and the raise is to be retroactive to March 1, 1955. I am reliably informed, and I have no reason to doubt this, that this will give them a slight advance over the postal employees because of the retroactive clause.

In fact, it will take 27 months for the postal employees to catch up with them, dollar for dollar, which, of course, is what we want to have. We do not want to have any difference between the classified and the postal field service.

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that this is being accomplished in this bill. I believe that the bill is fair. I believe it is a bill that can be passed. I believe it is a bill that will be signed into law. Of course, we all want more, and there is no objection to that either, but on the other hand we have to face certain facts. We have to face the fact that we have a Government away over its head in debt today. We have to face the fact that by and large our people in whatever kind of employment—and this goes for Government employees as well—are better paid than any people in the world. We must also remember that the minute we get very high in these brackets we have a real danger, and that is that we may well price ourselves and our country out of the markets of the world. That could take place just as much through raising salaries to an unrealistic height as through pricing goods and services above the world market prices. Certainly we could all do with more. Certainly we know that these employees are well worth their hire, just as the postal employees are, but I get around and I talk to a lot of these employees. They are my friends. I can say that sincerely. They are very well satisfied with this bill. They realize that it has been well thought through; that every side has been given a thorough hearing. While there may have been some wrangling, I think that on the whole the committee has come out with a worthy compromise. And what legislation ever comes to the floor of this House that is not a compromise? Sometimes not altogether as good a one or as worthy a one as the bill we are bringing before you today.

It is my earnest hope that this bill will be passed, and that it will be signed as written by this great Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, and would respectfully point out that there are two features which we ought to bear in mind. The one, I trust the conference committee will consider, is the differential in the pay raise.

As has been pointed out already, the vote was 12 to 12 on the question of 7½ percent as against 8 percent. I am hopeful that the conferees will consider that point in arriving at their report.

The other matter is that we are not able to adequately provide for those in the higher brackets, of the classified pay scale because we were confronted with a pay ceiling of $14,800. We cannot do justice today to those people and personnel in the executive branch without putting in proper position all of the executive pay scale. This will require raising the $14,800 ceiling and making salary adjustments in the executive pay scale which the Post Office and Civil Service Committee will undertake as soon as it has received the results of a study by and the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, first I want to congratulate the chairman of this fine committee for bringing in this bill. I am certain he always makes a special effort to be fair at all times.

I would like to say for the benefit of the people in the House and in my district back home that this is the sixth time I have voted for a salary increase for Federal employees since June 30, 1945. Many new Members do not realize that we have continually raised these employees' salaries almost every year since 1945. No one can say the Congress has not been extra good to Government employees—no industry in my district could afford to compete with the Government in salaries and leave. The Congressmen's salary was raised once since 1927, and that was in the amount of 25 percent and recently, 50 percent. If my figures are correct, we have raised the Federal employee's salaries in that same time approximately 100 percent. I expect to vote for this bill. However, I wanted the Members to know the Government employees have not been neglected.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to inquire of the distinguished chairman of the committee whether the retroactive feature of this bill applies to employees whose salaries are fixed administratively?

My concern arises specifically in the instance of Customs employees in Alaska, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii. The last time there was a general pay raise, a special act had to be passed to accommodate a like situation.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. My reply is that it is taken care of in section 8 of the bill and can be done by administrative action.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee not only for myself but on behalf of the Delegate from Hawaii, Mrs. FARRINGTON, and the Delegate from Puerto Rico, Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal today about the fact that some Members feel that the increase is not large enough. If these Members are dissatisfied with the bill they should vote against it. In my opinion the bill will become law in its present form. So if you do not like it then vote against it. If you believe it is the best bill that can be had under all the circumstances—then vote for it. I am convinced that there will be an overwhelming vote for this bill, and I take that vote to be one of confidence in the recommendations of our committee. I know too, this bill would not be coming before you today under this procedure, if it did not meet with the approval of the leadership on both sides.

Mr. Speaker, this is important legislation. It affects the salaries of more than 1 million employees of the Federal service. According to the last figures I have been able to obtain, there are 2,374,000 people employed by the Federal Government in this country and abroad. Incidentally, 221,000 are outside the United States. The figure also includes 21,000 in the legislative branch, 4,000 in the judicial branch, and 2,348,000 in the executive branch. Almost one-half of the employees of the executive branch are employed in the Department of Defense. About 21 percent, or approximately 506,000 persons, are in the Post Office Department. Another 8 percent, or 178,000 persons, serve veterans and their dependents. The remaining 21 percent of the executive branch perform various services including: State Department, Immigration Service, Department of Agriculture, Revenue Service, Social Security Administration, Public Health, Census, flood-control programs, and other agencies.

I would like for Members of the House to know that our committee has given this matter a great deal of study and consideration. It, like a lot of other legislation, is the result of compromise. I think it is fair. It is reasonable. Government employees, generally, will be pleased with our efforts.

This increase will be given to substantially every employee in the Government except in the postal field service, for which an average 8 percent increase already has been provided in Public Law 68, also employees whose salaries are fixed by wage boards according to local prevailing rates and those officials paid under the Executive Pay Act.

The pay increases in this bill amount to $326,000,000. I mention this to demonstrate we are not talking in terms of a few dollars here and there. I am informed this amount may be reduced considerably, possibly as much as 25 percent, by direction from the Bureau of the Budget to the agencies not to employ

additional employees where vacancies occur on account of resignations, retirement, or other causes. Not by unnecessary dismissals, but by attrition.

The officers and employees whose salaries are increased in this bill are, in general, the same ones who have received increases under earlier pay raise legislation over the past 10 years. The largest group of Federal employees to benefit will be 983,000 classified employees in the executive branch. Others included are: First, 20,000 employees in the Veterans' Administration, Department of Medicine and Surgery; second, approximately 52,000 employees whose salaries are fixed by administrative action; third, 9,683 foreign service officers and employees; fourth, 4,900 legislative employees; and fifth, 3,536 employees including court reporters, in the judicial branch.

It has been claimed on the floor of the House today that classified employees are not being treated as well as those in the postal service were treated in legislation recently approved by the Congress. They are doing as well as postal people. I do not want to argue the matter, but you may be interested in some concrete information on that subject.

I have selected at random several groups of employees to see exactly how much this pay increase will give them.

As an illustration, each of the 35,000 employees in the top of grade 4 will receive a $270 raise, bringing his basic compensation to $3,895 a year without longevity. The top pay for this grade just 10 years ago was only $2,160 a year.

Nearly 21,000 employees in the top of grade 7 each will receive a $375 raise, making the salary $5,270 a year; the top salary 10 years ago was $3,200 a year.

Each of the 16,000 employees in the top of grade 9 will receive a $440 increase, bringing his salary to $6,190 a year; the comparable salary 10 years ago was $3,800 a year.

One of the major factors in the pay-increase legislation is the increase in cost of living. According to testimony from Government agencies dealing with this problem, cost of living has risen about 3 percent since the last pay raise in 1951. One witness suggested 3½ percent. It would appear that a 7½-percent increase in pay should more than offset the cost of living increase in this bill.

The 7½-percent raise also will go to the many thousands of Federal employees who already are receiving salaries higher than the maximum salaries authorized by law for their positions. These higher salaries result from the so-called savings clauses which have been written into various laws whereby an individual whose salary is higher than a rate fixed by such a law is allowed to continue to receive the higher salary so long as he remains in the position.

For example, under the fringe benefits law of 1954 compensation—night differential, overtime, and holiday pay—of fire fighters, among others, will be fixed administratively at not over 25 percent above base salaries. One department fixed the percentage at 15 percent. So hereafter fire fighters in that department—except those under the savings clause—may receive no more than their basic compensation plus 15 percent for premium compensation.

Prior to the fringe benefits law many fire fighters were receiving premium compensation totaling 30 percent or more of their basic salaries. The savings clause was written into the law to protect their right to continue to receive this higher rate of premium compensation. Consequently, thousands of fire fighters presently are receiving aggregate compensation as high as 30 percent above the basic rates provided by law for their grades.

The bill now before the House guarantees these fire fighters their present aggregate salaries, plus an additional 7½ percent of the top basic salary for their grades. In effect, it will continue their salaries 15 percent above the highest rates generally authorized by law. This is authorized because S. 67 is purely a salary increase bill.

Perhaps the most attractive feature of this bill is the retroactive provision. Each officer and employee whose salary is increased by the bill will receive a generous retroactive pay check, dating back to the first pay period beginning after February 28 of this year.

Assuming that this bill becomes law in the near future and that the period of retroactivity ends with the end of the pay period on July 2, here are some of the back-pay checks that will go out shortly thereafter:

Each of the 16,000 employees I mentioned, who are in the top of grade 9, would receive $131 in retroactive pay; each of those in the top of grade 7 will receive $114; and each of those in the top of grade 4 will receive $87.

The committee also wrote into this legislation specific provisions to make the increases available to many thousands of employees who would not otherwise have received such benefits because of having been transferred to wage-board positions.

Many thousands of employees previously transferred to wage-board positions under the Classification Act of 1949 or the fringe benefits law of 1954 will have their wage-board rates recalculated to make certain they receive the full benefits of this pay increase on the same basis as though they had not been transferred to wage-board positions until after the increase becomes effective.

There is also a small group of employees who transferred from the wage-board system to classified schedules who will be given similar protection.

There are equitable provisions, designed to make sure that all employees receive equal treatment in granting this new pay increase.

The problem of the so-called supergrade positions—positions in grades 16, 17, and 18—in the Federal Government has been a matter of increasing concern to our committee and to many Members of Congress over the years since these positions were created in 1949.

The concept of supergrade positions originated in the Classification Act of 1949, which was reported by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. It was never intended that these positions be created, provided for, or dispensed, other than in legislation referred to our committee.

Unfortunately, there has been an increasing tendency on the part of departments and agencies to avoid the normal legislative process of obtaining their necessary supergrade positions in accordance with the procedures provided by the Classification Act of 1949. As a consequence, there is hardly a Member who knows how many supergrade positions there are, what laws granted them, and who occupies them.

The legislation now before us will clear up this situation. It amends, repeals, and consolidates existing provisions of law governing the number of positions in the supergrades. The committee believes that the Congress should be able to look to 1 law and to 1 agency in the executive branch—the Civil Service Commission—for overall authorization and control of these top-grade positions. The committee also believes that the Bureau of the Budget should exercise its full power to disapprove requests of departments for supergrade positions in addition to those provided for in this bill.

Under the bill, the usual and ordinary legislative procedures and process will obtain with respect to future requests for supergrade positions, in accordance with the appropriate committee jurisdiction. There will be no more than 1,200 supergrade positions, with a maximum of 125 for grade 18 and 325 for grade 17. These maximum numbers for grades 17 and 18 may be changed only by a majority vote of the Civil Service Commissioners.

The present system of separate authorizations for supergrade positions in the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the General Accounting Office, and the Library of Congress will be continued.

It is estimated there is an attrition of approximately 15 percent a year in Government employment. It means a turnover of more than 200,000 people who are separated from the service because of retirement, resignations, or death. It is my opinion there can be a considerable amount of reduction in the cost of Government employment if the agencies where vacancies occur will determine whether it is necessary to fill such a vacancy, or, if it is necessary for the vacancy to be filled, whether it may be done by transfer in the Government. In other words, no vacancy should be filled unless the necessity can be shown for employing additional people.

I am advised the Bureau of the Budget is considering reduction in the cost of Government by following this proceure. It is estimated that in doing so 25 percent of the cost of this measure can be absorbed.

I think attention should also be called to the fact that there has been a reduction of about 275,000, or 10 percent in Government employment since 1953. On the basis of these reductions, the total increase cost, as I indicated at the beginning, will not be as great as would first appear.

This legislation is fair, it is reasonable, it is equitable. If anyone is opposed to this legislation, he ought to vote against it. There are no pressures or demands

of any kind from me in respect to this matter. Vote as you please. I think still the legislation is fair and reasonable.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia, a member of our great committee.

Mr. BROYHILL. Is it the gentleman's understanding that an employee who is promoted between the retroactive date and the passage of this bill will receive the retroactive-pay increase based on the amount of his new salary as a result of the promotion?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is the intent of the legislation.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Florida, also a member of our committee.

Mr. FASCELL. Is it not true that this legislation covers the pay of all legislative employees and that it will add 7½ percent onto their gross and does not affect the basic allowance of the Members?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. This places an increase of 7½ percent on the gross pay of the employees?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman is eminently correct. The salary of the gross amount of pay received by an employee in a Member's office is increased by 7½ percent.

Mr. MASON. There is a difference between their gross pay and their base pay.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman's statement is correct.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, in my opinion, is equitable. It is the result of fair and careful consideration of the problem involved.

Of course, it will not satisfy everybody. Personally, I think employees, in general, will be pleased when it is enacted into law.

Some of the members of our own committee have expressed dissatisfaction with this proposed legislation. Eight or nine members of our own committee have filed what they describe as "additional views." They criticize this bill as well as other legislation approved for postal workers. They talk about "a long, hard fight" in considering this legislation. I attended every hearing. I did not observe any so-called fighting in the committee. I would not want the Members of this House to get that impression. There were differences of opinion. All opinions were carefully and amicably considered. The chairman of the committee was fair in giving all interested groups a chance to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, this measure is before the House under suspension of the rules. I think it ought to be approved. If you do not like it, you ought to vote against it. Some Members have spoken against it. Certainly they should vote against it. Those who signed the "additional views," will probably want to indicate their further opposition by voting against this bill. I would not want to attempt to persuade anyone to vote for or against it.

If there is anything you do not like about the bill, you will be given a chance to register that view. If it is too high, or too low to suit you then vote "No." Use your own judgment. There is no so-called pressure attached, insofar as I am concerned. I have tried to explain the measure, the legislation, as I see it. I stated before, I think the legislation is as fair as can be worked out. It is reasonable. It is equitable.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HESS] has been extremely interested in the legislation before the House today providing for salary increases for Federal employees. He regrets that official business of the Congress prevents his being present on the floor of the House today to participate in the proceedings.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to support the 7.5 percent Federal classified pay increase as reported by the committee, not necessarily because I believe it to be a good bill, but because I believe it to be the best bill that can be enacted into law. The many thousands of Federal employees in these United States are, I think, deserving of more consideration than is provided in this legislation. However, time grows short and I am fearful that any further boondoggling and delay may result in another postponement of this long overdue pay raise as it did a year ago. Consequently, and with great reluctance, I will cast my vote in support of this legislation. I am frank in saying it is my sincere hope that the conferees will adopt a more liberal view, and when this bill is returned to the House for final passage a more adequate increase will be afforded this loyal and conscientious group of Federal classified employees.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the consideration of the bill S. 67 under a suspension of the rules. I want it definitely understood that I am in favor of a fair pay increase for the classified Government employee. However, the bill S. 67 should be considered under regular rules of this House in order to permit amendments which in my opinion will make the pay increase more fair and equitable. The average increase should be at least as much as the average given in the postal pay increase bill. I am voting for this bill under the suspension of rules with the hope that the conferees will make the increase at least 8 percent. I will make this plea with the conferees. I believe the President will sign a bill making the increase in pay an average of 8 percent.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the House will approve S. 67 to grant pay increases for Federal and other related employees without further delay. Because I thought it was necessary to speed enactment of this legislation I supported the resolution to suspend the rules.

Some of us on the committee held out for an 8 percent pay-raise bill, instead of the 7½ percent measure which we are considering here today. I still feel that an 8 percent increase is thoroughly justified in view of the recent action on the postal employees pay bill. I will, however, vote for this pending bill since it is not possible to offer an 8 percent amendment under the suspension of the rules procedure governing the consideration of this bill.

Federal employees, like the postal-service employees, have waited an unnecessarily long time for their pay raises. They, too, were disappointed by the pocket veto of pay raise legislation last year.

The retroactive provisions of this bill, making the pay raise effective beginning with the first pay period commencing after February 28, 1955, is at least a partial recognition of the inequities caused by delay and an attempt to remedy them.

I am hopeful that the House-Senate conference committee will retain this retroactive date and at the same time agree on an 8 percent pay raise figure for our Federal employees.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that I have been unavoidably detained from Washington because of the critical illness in my family. I feel, however, that my constituents should know how I would have voted on the matter that came before the House today, pay increase for Federal employees. I have always supported the maximum pay raise that the President would approve. I did so in voting for the postal workers pay raise and would have voted for the 7.5 percent increase for Federal workers if I had been present today.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the bill now under consideration to increase the rates of basic compensation of Federal employees is meritorious and deserves the favorable action of this House.

This legislation will increase the compensation of approximately 1,073,262 Federal employees in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government. The increase amounts to 7½ percent of basic compensation and is effective retroactively to March 1, 1955.

The hearings held by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House have been extensive and cover a long period of time. Testimony was received from the Civil Service Commission, Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, and representatives of national employees' organizations. All of this made plain the justification of an increase. It was a real problem, however, to determine the amount of such increase and how it was to be applied to existing rates of compensation.

The Civil Service Commisison during the early part of this present session of Congress recommended an average increase of 4.9 percent. However, after it was determined that the postal employees should receive a larger increase than the 4.9 percent, and, the Congress so approved, there was no reason that would

justify other Government employees receiving a lesser increase. Consequently, it was determined by the committee, and, it so reported to the House, that the increase for Government employees in other Departments should be the same, as near as practicable, to that previously agreed upon at this session for postal employees. This in my opinion is right and just to all concerned.

I am strongly of the opinion that the increase in cost of living since 1951, together with the necessity of providing for our Government workers an opportunity to enjoy a rising standard of living, is sufficient justification for the passage of this legislation. It has my full-hearted support. I shall vote to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I favor this bill and rise in support of its passage.

I feel that the classified Federal civil-service employees should receive a pay raise equal to that which Congress voted the postal workers, and I therefore introduced House bill 5899 which provided for these workers a pay increase of 8 percent. When the amount of the increase was under consideration by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the vote for 8 percent was a tie vote of 12 for and 12 against. This vote, of course, was not sufficient to report the 8 percent bill. Inasmuch as the committee did not take favorable action on the 8 percent proposal, I supported the next highest amount before the committee, which was 7.5 percent, and that is the figure which is in the bill now before us for consideration.

We made the postal workers salary legislation retroactive to March 1, and the bill which I introduced carried that same retroactive provision. Senate bill S. 67 which we are now considering, I am glad to say, contains also this retroactive provision.

While the amount of the raise carried in this bill does not quite equal the amount of the postal workers' pay raise, it is substantially more than the amount of the raise recommended by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission when he testified before our committee.

I have been asked by a few classified Federal civil-service employees to hold out for a raise of 10 percent or nothing. I would like to see all these employees receive a 10 percent increase, but I am confident such a bill would be vetoed if Congress enacted it, and a vetoed act of Congress will not pay bills and it will not buy groceries. I believe the logical step to take now is to vote out a bill which the President will sign, make it retroactive to March 1, and let these Federal employees begin to benefit by the legislation immediately.

For that reason I am actively supporting the bill which is before us, and hope that it will pass the House today overwhelmingly.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY].

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, the other day we were happy to witness "operation alert." I have an idea that the pending legislation might well be termed "operation grocery basket." I serve on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and at one point we were 12 to 12 for an 8 percent increase. I was one of those who voted for 8 percent. We seemed to be at an impasse. However, due to the action of our honored chairman, who conducted the hearings in a very fair, forthright manner throughout the entire consideration of this measure, we arrived at this compromise. This is a good compromise, even though I am still for 8 percent and even though, I might say to the gentleman from Kansas, I signed the accompanying views. But I suggest that they be read in their "Pickwickian sense," and in that light I do not think he will feel so badly. If you are for 8 percent, you should vote for this measure, because it may become 8 percent eventually. For those who think 7.5 percent is all right, you should vote for it, because this is a good measure; it is a good deal, and it represents your views. If the Senate raises it to 8, so much the better. Nevertheless, I think a fair and decent compromise has been worked out. I think the members of both parties feel that way, and I think this happy result is due to the fair, cooperative spirit in which both sides entered into the compromise suggested by our distinguished chairman. I think this measure is going to make the grocery basket a little heavier for the classified employees, and I am quite certain when the measure is passed that they will be very happy to get the pay raise and also to get the retroactive bundle that goes with it. I hear spirits will be raised as their pay is raised—desperately so.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 370, nays 3, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 88]

YEAS—370

Abbitt	Baumhart	Budge
Abernethy	Beamer	Burdick
Adair	Becker	Burleson
Addonizio	Belcher	Burnside
Albert	Bennett, Fla.	Bush
Alexander	Bennett, Mich.	Byrd
Alger	Berry	Byrne, Pa.
Allen, Calif.	Betts	Byrnes, Wis.
Allen, Ill.	Blatnik	Cannon
Andersen, H. Carl	Blitch	Carlyle
	Boggs	Carnahan
Andresen, August H.	Boland	Carrigg
	Bolling	Cederberg
Andrews	Bolton, Frances P.	Celler
Anfuso		Chase
Arends	Bonner	Chelf
Ashley	Bosch	Chenoweth
Ashmore	Bow	Chiperfield
Aspinall	Bowler	Christopher
Auchincloss	Boykin	Chudoff
Avery	Boyle	Church
Ayres	Bray	Clark
Bailey	Brooks, La.	Clevenger
Baker	Brooks, Tex.	Cole
Baldwin	Brown, Ga.	Colmer
Barrett	Brown, Ohio	Coon
Bass, Tenn.	Broyhill	Cooper
Bates	Buchanan	Corbett
Coudert	Jenkins	Price
Cramer	Jennings	Priest
Cretella	Jensen	Quigley
Crumpacker	Johansen	Rabaut
Cunningham	Johnson, Calif.	Radwan
Curtis, Mass.	Johnson, Wis.	Rains
Dague	Jonas	Ray
Davidson	Jones, Ala.	Rees, Kans.
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Mo.	Reuss
Davis, Wis.	Jones, N. C.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Dawson, Ill.	Judd	Rhodes, Pa.
Dawson, Utah	Karsten	Richards
Deane	Kean	Riehlman
Delaney	Kearney	Riley
Denton	Keating	Rivers
Derounian	Kee	Roberts
Devereux	Kelley, Pa.	Robeson, Va.
Dies	Kelly, N. Y.	Robsion, Ky.
Dixon	Keogh	Rodino
Dollinger	Kilburn	Rogers, Colo.
Dolliver	Kilday	Rogers, Mass.
Dondero	Kilgore	Rogers, Tex.
Donohue	King, Calif.	Rooney
Donovan	King, Pa.	Rutherford
Dorn, N. Y.	Kirwan	St. George
Dorn, S. C.	Klein	Saylor
Dowdy	Kluczynski	Schenck
Doyle	Knox	Scherer
Edmondson	Krueger	Schwengel
Elliott	Laird	Scott
Ellsworth	Landrum	Scrivner
Engle	Lane	Seely-Brown
Fallon	Lanham	Selden
Fascell	Lankford	Sheehan
Feighan	Latham	Shelley
Fenton	LeCompte	Sheppard
Fernandez	Lesinski	Short
Fine	Lipscomb	Shuford
Fino	Long	Sieminski
Fisher	Lovre	Sikes
Fjare	McCarthy	Siler
Flood	McConnell	Simpson, Ill.
Flynt	McCormack	Simpson, Pa.
Fogarty	McCulloch	Sisk
Forand	McDonough	Smith, Kans.
Ford	McDowell	Smith, Miss.
Forrester	McIntire	Smith, Wis.
Fountain	McMillan	Spence
Frazier	Macdonald	Springer
Frelinghuysen	Machrowicz	Staggers
Friedel	Mack, Ill.	Steed
Fulton	Mack, Wash.	Sullivan
Garmatz	Madden	Talle
Gary	Magnuson	Taylor
Gavin	Mahon	Teague, Calif.
Gentry	Marshall	Teague, Tex.
George	Martin	Thomas
Gordon	Matthews	Thompson, La.
Granahan	Merrow	Thompson, Mich.
Grant	Metcalf	
Gray	Miller, Md.	Thompson, N. J
Green, Oreg.	Miller, Nebr.	Thompson, Tex.
Green, Pa.	Miller, N. Y.	Thomson, Wyo.
Gregory	Mills	Thornberry
Griffiths	Minshall	Trimble
Gross	Mollohan	Tuck
Hagen	Morano	Tumulty
Hale	Morgan	Udall
Haley	Moss	Utt
Halleck	Moulder	Vanik
Harden	Multer	Van Pelt
Hardy	Murray, Ill.	Van Zandt
Harris	Murray, Tenn.	Vinson
Harrison, Nebr.	Natcher	Vorys
Harrison, Va.	Nelson	Wainwright
Harvey	Nicholson	Walter
Hays, Ark.	Norblad	Watts
Hays, Ohio	Norrell	Weaver
Hayworth	O'Brien, Ill.	Westland
Henderson	O'Brien, N. Y.	Wickersham
Hill	O'Hara, Ill.	Widnall
Hillings	O'Hara, Minn.	Wigglesworth
Hoeven	O'Konski	Williams, Miss.
Hoffman, Ill.	O'Neill	Williams, N. J.
Hoffman, Mich.	Ostertag	Williams, N. Y.
Holifield	Passman	Willis
Holmes	Patman	Wilson, Calif.
Holt	Pelly	Wilson, Ind.
Holtzman	Perkins	Winstead
Hope	Pfost	Withrow
Horan	Philbin	Wolverton
Huddleston	Phillips	Wright
Hull	Pillion	Yates
Hyde	Poage	Young
Ikard	Poff	Zablocki
Jackson	Powell	Zelenko
Jarman	Preston	

NAYS—3

Mason	Taber	Vursell

NOT VOTING—61

Barden	Bolton, Oliver P.	Canfield
Bass, N. H.		Chatham
Bell	Brownson	Cooley
Bentley	Buckley	Curtis, Mo.

Davis, Tenn.	Hiestand	Prouty
Dempsey	Hinshaw	Reece, Tenn.
Diggs	Hosmer	Reed, Ill.
Dingell	James	Reed, N. Y.
Dodd	Kearns	Rogers, Fla.
Durham	Knutson	Roosevelt
Eberharter	McGregor	Sadlak
Evins	McVey	Scudder
Gamble	Mailliard	Smith, Va.
Gathings	Meader	Tollefson
Gubser	Miller, Calif.	Velde
Gwinn	Morrison	Wharton
Hand	Mumma	Whitten
Hébert	Osmers	Wier
Herlong	Patterson	Wolcott
Heselton	Pilcher	Younger
Hess	Polk	

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Patterson.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Scudder.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Polk with Mr. McVey.
Mr. Rogers of Florida with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Hosmers.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Dodd with Mr. Younger.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Hand.
Mrs. Knutson with Mr. Heselton.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Bentley.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. James.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Hiestand.
Mr. Gathings with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Brownson.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Velde.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its amendments to the bill (S. 67) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, ask for a conference with the Senate, and that the Chair appoint conferees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs MURRAY of Tennessee, DAVIS of Georgia, and REES of Kansas.

AMEND ACT OF JULY 31, 1947, AND THE MINING LAWS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 5891) to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1. The Secretary, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, may dispose of mineral materials (including but not limited to, sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, cinders, and clay) and vegetative materials (including but not limited to yucca, manzanita, mesquite, cactus, and timber or other forest products) on public lands of the United States, including for the purposes of this act land described in the acts of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 874) and of June 24, 1954 (68 Stat. 270), if the disposal of such mineral or vegetative materials (1) is not otherwise expressly authorized by law, including the United States mining laws, and (2) is not expressly prohibited by laws of the United States, and (3) would not be detrimental to the public interest. Such materials may be disposed of only in accordance with the provisions of this act and upon the payment of adequate compensation therefor, to be determined by the Secretary: *Provided, however,* That, to the extent not otherwise authorized by law, the Secretary is authorized in his discretion to permit any Federal, State, or Territorial agency, unit or subdivision, including municipalities, or any person, or any association or corporation not organized for profit, to take and remove, without charge, materials, and resources subject to this act, for use other than for commercial or industrial purposes or resale. Where the lands have been withdrawn in aid of a function of a Federal department or agency other than the Department headed by the Secretary of a State, Territory, county, municipality, water district, or other local governmental subdivision or agency, the Secretary may make disposals under this act only with the consent of such other Federal department or agency or of such State, Territory, or local governmental unit. Nothing in this act shall be construed to apply to lands in any national park, or national monument or to any Indian lands, or lands set aside or held for the use or benefit of Indians, including lands over which jurisdiction has been transferred to the Department of the Interior by Executive order for the use of Indians. As used in this act, the word "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior except that it means the Secretary of Agriculture where the lands involved are administered by him for national-forest purposes or for the purposes of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act or where withdrawn for the purpose of any other function of the Department of Agriculture: *Provided,* That, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, such leases or permits may be issued for lands administered for national park, monument, and wildlife purposes only when the President, by Executive order, finds and declares that such action is necessary in the interests of national defense."

SEC. 2. That section 3 of the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), as amended by the act of August 31, 1950 (64 Stat. 571), is amended to read as follows:

"All moneys received from the disposal of materials under this act shall be disposed of in the same manner as moneys received from the sale of public lands, except that moneys received from the disposal of materials by the Secretary of Agriculture shall be disposed of in the same manner as other moneys received by the Department of Agriculture from the administration of the lands from which the disposal of materials is made, and except that revenues from the lands described in the act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 874) and the act of June 24, 1954 (68 Stat. 270) shall be disposed of in accordance with said acts and except that moneys received from the disposal of materials from school section lands in Alaska, reserved under section 1 of the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1214), shall be set apart as separate and permanent funds in the Territorial treasury, as provided for income derived from said school section lands pursuant to said act."

SEC. 3. A deposit of common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, or cinders shall not be deemed a valuable mineral deposit within the meaning of the mining laws of the United States so as to give effective validity to any mining claim hereafter located under such mining laws: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein shall affect the validity of any mining location based upon discovery of some other mineral occurring in or in association with such a deposit. "Common varieties" as used in this act does not include deposits of such materials which are valuable because the deposit has some property giving it distinct and special value and does not include so-called "block pumice" which occurs in nature in pieces having one dimension of 2 inches or more.

SEC. 4. (a) Any mining claim hereafter located under the mining laws of the United States shall not be used, prior to issuance of patent therefor, for any purposes other than prospecting, mining, or processing operations and uses reasonably incident thereto.

(b) Rights under any mining claim hereafter located under the mining laws of the United States shall be subject, prior to issuance of patent therefor, to the right of the United States to manage and dispose of the vegetative surface resources thereof and to manage other surface resources thereof (except mineral deposits subject to location under the mining laws of the United States). Any such mining claim shall also be subject, prior to issuance of patent therefor, to the right of the United States, its permittees and licensees, to use so much of the surface thereof as may be necessary for such purposes or for access to adjacent land: *Provided, however,* That any use of the surface of any such mining claim by the United States, its permittees or licensees, shall be such as not to endanger or materially interfere with prospecting, mining, or processing operations or uses reasonably incident thereto.

(c) Except to the extent required for the mining claimant's prospecting, mining, or processing operations and uses reasonably incident thereto, or for the construction of buildings or structures in connection therewith, or to provide clearance for such operations or uses, or to the extent authorized by the United States, no claimant of any mining claim hereafter located under the mining laws of the United States shall, prior to issuance of patent therefor, sever, remove or use any vegetative or other surface resources thereof which are subject to management or disposition by the United States under the preceding subsection (b). Any severance or removal of timber which is permitted under the exceptions of the preceding sentence, other than severance or removal to provide clearance, shall be in accordance with sound principles of forest management.

SEC. 5. (a) The head of a Federal department or agency which has the responsibility for administering surface resources of any lands belonging to the United States may file as to such lands in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, or in such office as the Secretary of the Interior may designate, a request for publication of notice to mining claimants, for determination of surface rights, which request shall contain a description of the lands covered thereby, showing the section or sections of the public land surveys which embrace the lands covered by such request, or if such lands are unsurveyed, either the section or sections which would probably embrace such lands when the public land surveys are extended to such lands or a tie by courses and distances to an approved United States mineral monument.

The filing of such request for publication shall be accompanied by an affidavit or affidavits of a person or persons over 21 years of age setting forth that the affiant or affiants have examined the lands involved in a reasonable effort to ascertain whether any person or persons were in actual possession of or engaged in the working of such lands or any part thereof, and, if no person or persons were found to be in actual possession of or engaged in the working of said lands or any part thereof on the date of

such examination, setting forth such fact, or, if any person or persons were so found to be in actual possession or engaged in such working on the date of such examination, setting forth the name and address of each such person, unless affiant shall have been unable through reasonable inquiry to obtain information as to the name and address of any such person, in which event the affidavit shall set forth fully the nature and results of such inquiry.

The filing of such request for publication shall also be accompanied by the certificate of a title or abstract company, or of a title abstractor, or of an attorney, based upon such company's, abstractor's, or attorney's examination of those instruments which are shown by the tract indexes in the county office of record as affecting the lands described in said request, setting forth the name of any person disclosed by said instruments to have an interest in said lands under any unpatented mining claim heretofore located, together with the address of such person if such address is disclosed by such instruments of record. "Tract indexes" as used herein shall mean those indexes, if any, as to surveyed lands identifying instruments as affecting a particular legal subdivision of the public land surveys, and as to unsurveyed lands identifying instruments as affecting a particular probable legal subdivision according to a projected extension of the public land surveys.

Thereupon, the Secretary of the Interior, at the expense of the requesting department or agency, shall cause notice to mining claimants to be published in a newspaper having general circulation in the county in which the lands involved are situate.

Such notice shall describe the lands covered by such request, as provided heretofore, and shall notify whomever it may concern that if any person claiming or asserting under, or by virtue of, any unpatented mining claim heretofore located, rights as to such lands or any part thereof, shall fail to file in the office where such request for publication was filed (which office shall be specified in such notice) and within 150 days from the date of the first publication of such notice (which date shall be specified in such notice), a verified statement which shall set forth, as to such unpatented mining claim—

(1) the date of location;

(2) the book and page of recordation of the notice or certificate of location;

(3) the section or sections of the public land surveys which embrace such mining claim; or if such lands are unsurveyed, either the section or sections which would probably embrace such mining claim when the public land surveys are extended to such lands or a tie by courses and distances to an approved United States mineral monument;

(4) whether such claimant is a locator or purchaser under such location; and

(5) the name and address of such claimant and names and addresses so far as known to the claimant of any other person or persons claiming any interest or interests in or under such unpatented mining claim;

such failure shall be conclusively deemed (i) to constitute a waiver and relinquishment by such mining claimant of any right, title, or interest under such mining claim contrary to or in conflict with the limitations or restrictions specified in section 4 of this act as to hereafter located unpatented mining claims, and (ii) to constitute a consent by such mining claimant that such mining claim, prior to issuance of patent therefor, shall be subject to the limitations and restrictions specified in section 4 of this act as to hereafter located unpatented mining claims, and (iii) to preclude thereafter, prior to issuance of patent, any assertion by such mining claimant of any right or title to or interest in or under such mining claim contrary to or in conflict with the limitations or restrictions specified in section 4 of this act as to hereafter located unpatented mining claims.

If such notice is published in a daily paper, it shall be published in the Wednesday issue for 9 consecutive weeks, or, if in a weekly paper, in 9 consecutive issues, or if in a semiweekly or triweekly paper, in the issue of the same day of each week for 9 consecutive weeks.

Within 15 days after the date of first publication of such notice, the department or agency requesting such publication (1) shall cause a copy of such notice to be personally delivered to or to be mailed by registered mail addressed to each person in possession or engaged in the working of the land whose name and address is shown by an affidavit filed as aforesaid, and to each person who may have filed, as to any lands described in said notice, a request for notices, as provided in subsection (d) of this section 5, and shall cause a copy of such notice to be mailed by registered mail to each person whose name and address is set forth in the title or abstract company's or title abstractor's or attorney's certificate filed as aforesaid, as having an interest in the lands described in said notice under any unpatented mining claim heretofore located, such notice to be directed to such person's address as set forth in such certificate; and (2) shall file in the office where said request for publication was filed an affidavit showing that copies have been so delivered or mailed.

(b) If any claimant under any unpatented mining claim heretofore located which embraces any of the lands described in any notice published in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section 5, shall fail to file a verified statement, as above provided, within 150 days from the date of the first publication of such notice, such failure shall be conclusively deemed, except as otherwise provided in subsection (e) of this section 5, (i) to constitute a waiver and relinquishment by such mining claimant of any right, title, or interest under such mining claim contrary to or in conflict with the limitations or restrictions specified in section 4 of this act as to hereafter located unpatented mining claims, and (ii) to constitute a consent by such mining claimant that such mining claim, prior to issuance of patent therefor, shall be subject to the limitations and restrictions specified in section 4 of this act as to hereafter located unpatented mining claims, and (iii) to preclude thereafter, prior to issuance of patent, any assertion by such mining claimant of any right or title to or interest in or under such mining claim contrary to or in conflict with the limitations or restrictions specified in section 4 of this act as to hereafter located unpatented mining claims.

(c) If any verified statement shall be filed by a mining claimant as provided in subsection (a) of this section 5, then the Secretary of the Interior shall fix a time and place for a hearing to determine the validity and effectiveness of any right or title to, or interest in or under such mining claim, which the mining claimant may assert contrary to or in conflict with the limitations and restrictions specified in section 4 of this act as to hereafter located unpatented mining claims, which place of hearing shall be in the county where the lands in question or parts thereof are located, unless the mining claimant agrees otherwise. Where verified statements are filed asserting rights to an aggregate of more than 20 mining claims, any single hearing shall be limited to a maximum of 20 mining claims unless the parties affected shall otherwise stipulate and as many separate hearings shall be set as shall be necessary to comply with this provision. The procedures with respect to notice of such a hearing and the conduct thereof, and in respect to appeals shall follow the then established procedures and rules of practice of the Department of the Interior in respect to contests or protests affecting public lands of the United States. If, pursuant to such a hearing the final decision rendered in the matter shall affirm the validity and effectiveness of any mining claimant's so-asserted right or interest under the mining claim, then no subsequent proceedings under this section 5 of this act shall have any force or effect upon the so-affirmed right or interest of such mining claimant under such mining claim. If at any time prior to a hearing the department or agency requesting publication of notice and any person filing a verified statement pursuant to such notice shall so stipulate, then to the extent so stipulated, but only to such extent, no hearing shall be held with respect to rights asserted under that verified statement, and to the extent defined by the stipulation the rights asserted under that verified statement shall be deemed to be unaffected by that particular published notice.

(d) Any person claiming any right under or by virtue of any unpatented mining claim heretofore located and desiring to receive a copy of any notice to mining claimants which may be published as above provided in subsection (a) of this section 5, and which may affect lands embraced in such mining claim, may cause to be filed for record in the county office of record where the notice or certificate of location of such mining claim shall have been recorded, a duly acknowledged request for a copy of any such notice. Such request for copies shall set forth the name and address of the person requesting copies and shall also set forth, as to each heretofore located unpatented mining claim under which such person asserts rights—

(1) the date of location;

(2) the book and page of the recordation of the notice or certificate of location; and

(3) the section or sections of the public land surveys which embrace such mining claim; or if such lands are unsurveyed, either the section or sections which would probably embrace such mining claim when the public land surveys are extended to such lands or a tie by courses and distances to an approved United States mineral monument.

Other than in respect to the requirements of subsection (a) of this section 5 as to personal delivery or mailing of copies of notices and in respect to the provisions of subsection (e) of this section 5, no such request for copies of published notices and no statement or allegation in such request and no recordation thereof shall affect title to any mining claim or to any land or be deemed to constitute constructive notice to any person that the person requesting copies has, or claims, any right, title, or interest in or under any mining claim referred to in such request.

(e) If any department or agency requesting publication shall fail to comply with the requirements of subsection (a) of this section 5 as to the personal delivery or mailing of a copy of notice to any person, the publication of such notice shall be deemed wholly ineffectual as to that person or as to the rights asserted by that person and the failure of that person to file a verified statement, as provided in such notice, shall in no manner affect, diminish, prejudice or bar any rights of that person.

SEC. 6. The owner or owners of any unpatented mining claim heretofore located may waive and relinquish all rights thereunder which are contrary to or in conflict with the limitations or restrictions specified in section 4 of this act as to hereafter located unpatented mining claims. The execution and acknowledgment of such a waiver and relinquishment by such owner or owners and the recordation thereof in the office where the notice or certificate of location of such

mining claim is of record shall render such mining claim thereafter and prior to issuance of patent subject to the limitations and restrictions in section 4 of this act in all respect as if said mining claim had been located after enactment of this act, but no such waiver or relinquishment shall be deemed in any manner to constitute any concession as to the date of priority of rights under said mining claim or as to the validity thereof.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this act shall be construed in any manner to limit or restrict or to authorize the limitation or restriction of any existing rights of any claimant under any valid mining claim heretofore located, except as such rights may be limited or restricted as a result of a proceeding pursuant to section 5 of this act, or as a result of a waiver and relinquishment pursuant to section 6 of this act; and nothing in this act shall be construed in any manner to authorize inclusion in any patent hereafter issued under the mining laws of the United States for any mining claim heretofore or hereafter located, of any limitation or restriction not otherwise authorized by law, or to limit or repeal any existing authority to include any limitation or restriction in any such patent.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] for 20 minutes.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to amend the mining laws and to provide for multiple use of some of the public land areas subject to mining claims.

This legislation was introduced by a number of Members of this House: the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] being the author of the bill presently before us. Bills of similar character were introduced by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON], the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. YOUNG], the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE], the gentleman from Montana [Mr. FJARE], and by myself.

Similar legislation has been introduced on the Senate side and, as I understand, has been favorably acted on by the Senate committee.

The legislation has a favorable report from the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture, and those reports have been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, was drafted in a joint conference between representatives of the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, and various conservation groups, including the National Lumber Associations, the American Mining Congress and representatives of the lumber industry. Page 15 of the report contains a list of the various State and local groups which have endorsed and are supporting this legislation, including the American Mining Congress, American Federation of Labor, Independent Timber Farmers of America, the American Forestry Association, Western Lumber Manufacturers, National Wildlife Federation, Sports Afield, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, National Farmers Union, Wildlife Management Institute, the Izaak Walton League of America, the National Grange, Northwest Mining Association, Northern Rocky Mountain Sportsmen's Association, Western Forest Industries Association, Western Forestry and Conservation Association, United States Chamber of Commerce, Society of American Foresters, and the American Nature Association.

These organizations have taken a great interest in this legislation because of the problem that it seeks to handle. The problem arises from the fact that the mining law that exists today on the statute books of this country was passed in 1872. There have been recurring instances of abuse of these mining laws in recent years due to the filing of mining claims for the purpose of establishing fishing camps and recreational resorts of various types on public-domain land, and there has been a growing and continuing conflict in the use of the surface of the public-land areas between the mine claimants, the livestock people, those interested in recreation, fish and wildlife, and the lumber handlers.

As a consequence of all of that, it has become increasingly apparent to us that it would be necessary to enact legislation eliminating the filing of phony mining claims which are a real abuse of the mining laws and which the mining industry gives no support whatever.

In addition to that, there are thousands of stale and dormant mining claims throughout the national forests and the public domain areas of this country which should be dealt with; otherwise they simply lay there and clutter up the public-domain areas.

In the last session of the Congress the Committee on Agriculture of the House reported a bill relating to this subject matter as did the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs which reported the bill now before you. Because there were differences in those bills and because the two committees had some differences with reference to their approach to this problem, it was suggested to the Rules Committee before which those bills were pending that the matter be held in abeyance until the two committees had time to get together and work out satisfactory legislation.

This particular legislation has the approval of those gentlemen who supported the legislation in the Committee on Agriculture. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] appeared before our committee at the time of the hearings on this legislation in support of it. As I said then, the purpose of the legislation is to amend the general mining laws to permit a more efficient management and administration and to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands.

On page 2 of our report, which is available to you, in 5 separate categories we have outlined very generally what the objectives of this legislation are.

To begin with, we amend the Materials Act of 1947 to prohibit future location and removal, under the mining laws, of common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, and cinders, by requiring disposition of these materials under the Materials Act. The reason we have done that is because sand, stone, gravel, pumice, and pumicite are really building materials, and are not the type of material contemplated to be handled under the mining laws, and that is precisely where we have had so much abuse of the mining laws, because people can go out and file mining claims on sand, stone, gravel, pumice, and pumicite taking in recreational sites and even taking in valuable stands of commercial timber in the national forests and on the public domain.

That portion of the bill will eliminate those items which are essentially building materials and put them under the Materials Act of 1947—the latter is the second major objective of this legislation and provided for in it. The third is an amendment to the general mining law to prohibit the use of any hereafter located mining claims for any purposes other than prospecting, mining, processing, and related activities. The information our committee had was that there was a good deal of filing of mining claims to get a good cabin site on a fine mountain stream for the purpose of fishing. In other instances, mining claims were filed on what were really resort locations. This amendment to the bill will prohibit the use of mining claims for any purpose except bona fide mining.

The fourth general objective is to amend the general mining law to limit the rights of a holder of an unpatented mining claim hereafter located to the use of the surface and surface resources. The bill would accomplish this by vesting in the responsible United States administrative agency authority to manage and dispose of vegetative surface resources on such locations, to manage other surface resources thereof (except minerals subject to the mining laws), and to use so much of the surface as is necessary for management purposes or for access to adjacent lands. Now, boiled down in simple terms, that simply means that they can take timber and use the surface of mining claims for the purpose of disposing of grass and other forage for animals.

No. 5—and this is a very important provision in this bill—establishes, with respect to invalid, abandoned, or dormant mining claims, located prior to enactment of the bill, an in rem procedure in the nature of a quiet-title action, whereby the United States could expeditiously resolve uncertainties as to surface rights on such locations.

Mr. Speaker, that is what this legislation does. As far as I know, it has no

opposition whatever. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] who will address this House a little later, thought perhaps the bill could go somewhat further, but I believe in the main he does support the objectives of this legislation, and except for his reservation, it passed our committee by unanimous action. It has the approval of both major Departments of the Government involving the administration of these lands and also has, as I said before, very broad coauthorship in this House as well as this very, very impressive group of organizations—conservation, lumber, mining, livestock, and forestry industry—primarily interested in the use of the public domain areas.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I am particularly interested in this legislation with respect to these invalid, abandoned, and dormant mining claims, and the gentleman is satisfied now that this legislation will permit the Department to go in and have those matters straightened out. They have been a bone of contention for many years and this legislation is long overdue. But, the gentleman feels certain that this legislation will enable the Department to clear up these matters with respect to abandoned claims.

Mr. ENGLE. I do, indeed. And it is a rather ticklish matter, I will say to the gentleman, because it involves what are known in law as vested rights. That involves an in rem proceeding, according to the best lawyers in the business who worked it out. I think it will do a great deal to eliminate those old, stagnant, dormant claims lying around.

Mr. GAVIN. And this proposed legislation meets the approval of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture; is that correct?

Mr. ENGLE. The answer to the gentleman is in the affirmative. A favorable report of the Department of Agriculture, of which, of course, the Forest Service is a part, is in the committee report, and the Forest Service representatives themselves appeared before our committee and testified in support of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. One of the complaints of sportsmen in the past has been that those who have mining locations have denied access to hunters and fishermen, so far as their mining claims are concerned. In the opinion of the gentleman, under the proposed legislation, will a mining locator be able to deny access to a fisherman who wants to stand on his land and fish in the stream, or to a hunter who runs across his land in pursuit of a deer or who is chasing some partridges?

Mr. ENGLE. In my opinion, this proposed legislation does not broaden the rights of the people who go on mining claims except to the extent specifically described in the bill, which relates to the power of administrative agencies to manage the surface resources on the claim. In other words, it is not a broad authority to everybody to cross a mining claim who wants to do so. So the answer to the gentleman's question on that score is in the negative.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think the committee in bringing to the floor of the House H. R. 5891 has finally arrived at the proper method of handling mining claims which is satisfactory to the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior and to others who have been working with the problem. The bill spells out how we can use the mining claims and does away with the fraudulent use of those claims. The bill prevents the use of the claims as a guise for getting title to timber or getting possession of the land for a different purpose than that intended under the mining laws.

As the report has so well said, on page 2:

> If enacted, H. R. 5891 would also amend the general mining laws to permit more efficient management and administration of the surface resources of the public lands by providing for multiple use of the same tracts of such lands.

I think it does spell out and remove some of the uncertainty that has prevailed in respect to some of these mining claims. Again on page 8 of the report we find these words:

> The bill would also amend the general mining laws by defining the rights of locators to surface resources prior to patent for locations hereafter made; would establish procedures for more efficient management and administration of the surface resources on mining locations hereafter made; and would permit quieting of title to surface resources on locations made prior to the effective date of the act through procedures established in the act.

Those two quotations from the report I think sum up the effects of this legislation. The bill is in the interest of the public and it does clarify and spell out the use of mining claims that are now in existence and those that may be made in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in 1872 Congress passed "the mining laws," which have remained substantially unaltered until this year of 1955. This is the first material change that has been made in all of those years. As our distinguished chairman, the good gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] said, my only complaint with this bill is that it does not go far enough to correct the errors in the act of 1872.

This bill recognizes in principle the severance theory, that two people may own various levels of land. For many, many years, the miners of all minerals in the eastern States have recognized that theory. In view of the fact that from 1872 until 1955 the manner of prospecting for minerals has changed materially I sincerely believe that the Congress should take the necessary steps to recognize in full the severance theory. This bill is the first step in that direction.

One of the reasons I say this bill does not go far enough is that it still gives to a man who files a mining claim the right to cut the timber on his mining claim. Heretofore, the men would go in and file spurious mining claims. Those mining claims were filed for many reasons, principally because they found very valuable timber, others because they were looking for campsites or homesites or they were looking for commercial sites. Those things have been taken care of in the bill, but the one that has not been taken care of is that a man can still go in and file a mining claim if he finds known minerals, but he has the right to remove all of the merchantable timber from that tract, even though it has no relation whatsoever to the mining claim.

This is a glaring defect in this bill. It is one that I sincerely hope will be taken care of by special legislation. I have absolutely no complaint against a man who has a legitimate mining claim being entitled to use the timber necessary for his mining operation, but I vehemently oppose in principle, and I think I am joined by a majority of the conservation groups in America, in allowing a man to go in and file a mining claim, even a legitimate mining claim, and be given the right to use not only the timber which is necessary for his mining operation but whatever merchantable timber is found upon that entire tract.

That is the only glaring defect that exists in this bill. Despite this defect, I urge the adoption of this bill because it is a step in the right direction. The defect I have commented upon is one which has existed since 1872. It is one that I sincerely hope, in view of the diminishing returns which we are getting from our national forests, will be looked into in detail not only by the Committee on Agriculture in handling the affairs of our national forests but also by the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In addition to the forest lands that he can use, can he use the same area for grazing purposes?

Mr. SAYLOR. If he proceeds to patent he may use the surface for any reason whatsoever.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the author of the bill, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I shall not impose upon the House by taking a lot more time in explanation of this bill. The distinguished chairman of the committee has made a very able presentation of it. The ranking minority member of the committee and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] have pointed out the reasons and the necessity for the legislation. Frankly, it is simply a corrective measure moving another step in the direction of solving the many problems that have troubled the mining business.

Another step was taken last session when we passed Public Law 585, I believe it was, concerning the separation of those leasing minerals and the locatable minerals. This bill has to do with the surface rights. It is a piece of legislation that is explained in detail and in a very excellent manner in the report. I commend that report to you for your reading and your future reference.

The passage of this legislation is long overdue. I hope there will be no further delay in its adoption.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to take this time to commend the chairman of our committee for the most scholarly presentation he has made of the purposes of this bill. I would like to add that there has been much time and effort put into the planning and wording of this measure. For some years now, we have been attempting to properly define legitimate fields for the mining operators as well as for the people who are interested in the surface of our public lands. But, we have had a conflict and we are pleased to say that, in this bill, we have brought together the interests of the mining people as well as the conservationists and the forest people and others who are interested. It is a forward-looking measure, and one which is certainly going to redound to the benefit of the public generally.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. DIXON. I understand that the gentleman submitted a bill last year to prevent this fictitious filing of mining claims; is that not true?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. The gentleman is correct. I have always felt something should be done to cut out this filing of fictitious claims. Those who file on sand, gravel, cinders, and pumice certainly are not legitimate miners. They are doing the mining industry no good. I certainly think they should be deprived of the right to file such claims.

Mr. DIXON. What happened to that bill?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Of course, many of us introduced bills, but a bill by our former colleague from Texas, Mr. Regan, passed this House but was left to die on the other side. The first portion of this bill does include the sections of the Regan bill which would prohibit the filing on sand, gravel, and common material. So that part will be taken care of in this bill. The measure also goes further and limits the right of mining people to the subsurface rights with the exception of such building materials as they might need in their mining operations.

Mr. DIXON. I commend the gentleman for following through on this legislation which will correct such a glaring evil. I hope the bill will pass and also be passed by the other body.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. May I say to my colleague, I did have meetings with the forest people and the mining people and others before this measure was introduced. They are all in agreement on it. Now is the time to act, while we have them all in agreement. This measure is worthy of your support and I urge its favorable consideration under a suspension of the rules.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in taking this minute, and perhaps another minute, if it is necessary, is to ask a question of the distinguished chairman with reference to this bill. First, may I say I think it is an excellent bill. The question which I wish to ask the distinguished chairman is with reference to the following matter. It has been represented to me by lumbermen who live in my part of the country and who operate sawmills and box factories that the Forest Service has permitted a great many trees to become overaged. We all know that trees, just like any other crop, when they get ripe should be cut down or harvested the same as any other crop. These men, who have represented this to me, are men who have had experience in the lumber business and I have taken their word that the representations concerning the failure to harvest trees when they are ripe is true. I wonder if the chairman would tell me whether in his opinion the Department of Agriculture and the Forestry Department is permitting any large group of trees to become overage and overripe, and will this bill help to correct that situation?

Mr. ENGLE. It is my opinion that the Forestry Service is letting a great deal of timber become overripe and fall down as a result of overmaturity. I agree with the gentleman that when the tree gets old enough to be cut down, it should be cut down, otherwise it is wasted just the same as any other crop may go to waste. This bill relates to that problem because it would permit the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to dispose of mature trees on mining claims which they cannot do under the present law.

This bill would amend that law so that they can go in and harvest those trees. With reference to those areas in the national forests where mining claims have not been filed, the only way to perk up the Forest Service and get disposition of that timber is to keep after them and to provide them with the money to survey that timber and mark that out for sale. In other words, the gentleman has asked a question that is broader than this bill. This bill relates only to mining claims. As to that particular feature it is helpful in the line that the gentleman wants to go; namely, the disposition and marketing of mature and overripe timber on mining claims. This bill would permit that to be done.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I associate myself with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] regarding mining claims and the situation that permits them to use a mining claim for many other purposes than for mining. We should remove those purposes and permit mining claims only to use the land for mining purposes.

I hope this bill passes as I believe it is a constructive step in the conservation of our trees and the harvesting of them to produce the best lumber.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, this is as fine a bill as has been brought out from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs since I have been a Member of Congress.

I call particular attention to one feature of this bill. We have many unpatented mining claims throughout the public domain. Those claims are not being used by anybody. In many instances there never have been any minerals on those claims. The assessment work required by law is not kept up. But there is nothing under the present law that the Government can do about this situation. One time assessment work is important is when a claim is jumped, and it is necessary to prove the original claimant. The only other time assessment work must be proved is when he applies for patent. He must make proof in order to get patent. If his claim is never jumped and he does not apply for patent, then the claim stays outstanding for years as a cloud upon the title of the Government, and as a deterrent to the use which the people of the United States can make of the public domain.

This particular bill provides for an in rem proceeding, whereby the United States Government may, if it so desires, come in and quiet title on these long dormant rights which certainly serve no useful purpose for anyone.

It is a good bill and I hope it is passed.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, first I wish to congratulate the woodsman, trapper, aviator, and so forth, chairman of the committee on his presentation in behalf of this bill, and the authors for their efforts in presenting this legislation.

This bill indicates the necessity for a modern-day look at our national resources. As our population increases, as more areas are taken out of a raw wilderness, the necessity increases for the wise use of our remaining open and wilderness areas. This bill contributes to that wiser use. Perhaps it does not go far enough.

In my area there are uranium hunters swarming all over the countryside. There is hardly a foot of land along any highway that is not staked out with some kind of a claim, perhaps 3 or 4 on top of each other. The problem of preserving adequate habitats for fish and other wildlife is becoming more crucial throughout the United States. I am certain this legislation will make a major contribution toward clarifying some of these problems which have come along with this heavy modern use of what formerly were waste areas.

I hope the committee, of which the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] is chairman, will watch this new law in operation, and perhaps come up with some further recommendations that will preserve the areas and the best use of those areas as we all desire them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to commend the committee for the prompt and careful consideration of this bill. I am one of the coauthors of the bill and am very pleased to see it on the floor here today. I feel certain there is no doubt about its passage, because it is not only a good piece of legislation but also it is long overdue.

May I say with reference to the question that was asked by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. YOUNG] regarding the rights of sportsmen, hunters, and fishermen to go on the mining claims filed after the enactment of this act that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], in reply to the question by the gentleman from Nevada, indicated that the bill does not protect the rights of recreationists on mining claims filed hereafter. I believe that if the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], will recheck subsection (b) of section 4 on page 5 of the bill, he will agree with me that this bill does give rights to recreationists on national forest land even on those lands that have been filed upon for mining claims.

Section 4 (b) reads:

(b) Rights under any mining claim hereafter located under the mining laws of the United States shall be subject, prior to issuance of patent therefor, to the right of the United States to manage and dispose of the vegetative surface resources thereof and to manage other surface resources thereof.

In framing this bill the language of subsection (b) of section 4 was very, very carefully considered and carefully written with this thought in mind. We thought of protecting the rights of recreationists, sportsmen, and others to use the national forests for hunting, fishing, and recreation; so that the term "other resources thereon" protects the right of trespass.

Then it contains the language:

Such mining claims shall also be subject prior to the issuance of patent to the right of the United States, its permittees, licensees, to use so much of the surface thereof as may be necessary for such purposes or for access to adjacent land.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think this record in the debate on this bill should be taken to indicate clearly that it is the intent of Congress that a person who files on a mining claim hereafter in the national forest does not have the right to exclude recreationists or other permittees.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, from what I can learn of the contents of this legislation I think it is in the right direction and meritorious, and for that reason I would like to go on record as being in favor of it. However, the major purpose of asking for this time was to ask a question of the chairman of the committee.

We are having some extended litigation in the State of West Virginia growing out of the attempt of some individuals owning mineral rights under the Monongahela National Forest as well as in the State forest going in and opening up a coal-stripping operation. Our courts have decided against it, and there is a possibility that they are now going into the Federal courts.

There is a sizable section of the Monongahela National Forest barred to the National Government using the mineral rights. The Government acquired the surface rights but never owned the mineral rights, and it is creating considerable confusion.

I wanted to ask the chairman if he thought there was anything in this legislation that would clarify that situation where the mineral rights have been held by individuals before the Federal Government acquired surface rights. The mineral rights are still held either by individuals or by coal corporations.

Mr. ENGLE. This bill is not retroactive, therefore cannot affect the proposition the gentleman refers to one way or the other. The courts have held that a mining claim is a vested right or interest. There is no way you can go back and divest them of that interest without violating a provision of the Constitution. That is what made this problem so thorny and hard to handle under procedure and in dealing with stale and dormant mining claims. To answer the gentleman's question specifically, in my opinion the answer is "No," it does not affect it one way or the other.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute for the purpose of clarifying a situation referred to by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

It is my opinion that this bill does not give a broadside right to recreationists, sportsmen, and whoever else may be in the national forests or on the public domain to walk upon and to occupy, in connection with their activities, mining claims.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I believe the gentleman might be correct with reference to the public domain other than the national forests or national parks, wilderness areas, and that type of land. So far as the national forests are concerned, as I read the language it confers on the National Forests Administrator exactly the same rights he has on the surface as he has at the present in the remainder of the land.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

House Resolution 271 was laid upon the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION TO ATTEND THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to House Concurrent Resolution 109.

The Clerk read the House concurrent resolution, as follows:

Whereas a parliamentary conference of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization will meet in Paris in July 1955; and

Whereas among other items it is planned to discuss at the conference the question of future cooperation by the NATO members, including their parliamentary bodies; and

Whereas the Congress has taken a leading part in the formation of the Organization and in its support through the enactment of measures to strengthen its capacity to defend the North Atlantic area against Communist aggression; and

Whereas the presence of Members of the Congress at the conference will be a tangible demonstration of the continuing desire of the American people to support the Organization and to promote closer relations with and between the members of the Organization; and

Whereas such a conference can contribute to the strength of the North Atlantic area in the maintenance of peace and security and the mutual interests of its members: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That not to exceed 14 Members of Congress shall be appointed to meet jointly with the representative parliamentary groups from other NATO members meeting in conference in Paris in July 1955, for discussion of common problems in the interests of the maintenance of peace and security in the North Atlantic area. Of the Members of the Congress to be appointed for the purposes of this resolution, half shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House from Members of the House, and half shall be appointed by the President of the Senate from Members of the Senate. Not more than four of the appointees from the respective Houses shall be of the same political party.

The expenses incurred by Members of the House, the Senate, and by staff members appointed for the purpose of carrying out this concurrent resolution shall not exceed $15,000 for each House, respectively, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of which they are Members. Payment shall be made upon the submission of vouchers approved by the chairman of the respective House or Senate delegation.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution was unanimously reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House and placed on the Consent Calendar but passed over. We are now asking the House for endorsement of the action taken by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

This resolution provides for the appointment of a congressional delegation to attend the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference, the delegation to be composed of 7 Mem-

bers of the Senate and 7 Members of the House, not more than 4 to come from any one political party.

As of the present time the parliaments of 10 or 12 countries have already indicated that they will send delegations to this conference. As a matter of fact, the Canadian Government was particularly interested to the extent that the president of the Canadian senate came down here to confer with the Speaker of the House and the Vice President, also the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and on Foreign Affairs of the House.

In view of the fact that the North Atlantic Treaty countries are, in concert with us, spending hundreds of millions of dollars in support of that alliance, it is felt that it would be helpful to send a delegation from the United States Congress in order that we might observe at first hand what is going on over there. I do not think there will be much opposition to this resolution, Mr. Speaker. I do not see how there could be. But, the grounds that I have stated, I think, are correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. How much authority will be given these delegates to the conference? Will they be given the authority, for instance, to obligate us to further expenditures of money?

Mr. RICHARDS. No; they certainly will not.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Morally or legally?

Mr. RICHARDS. Morally or legally they cannot commit the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. As I understand, this is purely an exploratory conference to exchange ideas on what our various countries could do to move toward a peaceful solution of existing conditions.

Mr. RICHARDS. In harmony and unity. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We want to combine our efforts to see if we cannot move in the direction of peace by a little unity.

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. But there is no commitment to be made by anybody in our group, as I understand it.

Mr. RICHARDS. No commitment to be made by anyone for the United States. And, they are going to meet there, anyway, and it is thought that it would be wise for the United States to impress its viewpoint on that gathering.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am heartily in accord with the gentleman's plea, and I hope it will pass the House.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. As a matter of fact, the authority of this committee will be rather strictly limited. On page 2 of the bill they are authorized "to meet jointly with the representative parliamentary groups from other NATO members * * * for discussion of common problems in the interests of the maintenance of peace and security in the North Atlantic area." According to the text of the resolution, they can only discuss certain common problems in the interests of peace and security.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is right. And it is so written in the resolution.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask the gentleman will there be other parliamentary delegations at this meeting?

Mr. RICHARDS. Already 10 countries have signified their intention and passed resolutions of their parliamentary bodies to go there and be present. The Canadian Government has not only passed a resolution but has indicated its strong desire to go along with the United States.

Mr. SPRINGER. This is the first time, is it not, Mr. Speaker, that parliamentary bodies themselves have been present at these meetings?

Mr. RICHARDS. I would not say that. I think a year or two ago several countries met not as a special group, but as observers.

Mr. SPRINGER. The main purpose of this resolution is to bring the discussion which has previously been carried on more or less at what we call the administrative government level down to the parliamentary level, is it not, to exchange views as between them governing these overall problems?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is correct. Up until this time the emphasis has been placed on unity in the military. Now they want to emphasize and try to accomplish better civil unity, unity between themselves, particularly in regard to the parliamentary bodies which passed the laws by which NATO has the authority to operate.

Mr. SPRINGER. And this will be our first opportunity in this Congress to get a report directly back, is it not, from Members of our own body as to what the outlook is on NATO for the future?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is precisely correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. I want to commend the gentleman. I think it is a good resolution.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the people who this Government sends over there can neither morally nor legally bind our folks to anything.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then all they are going to do is talk about what is good for the world and for us?

Mr. RICHARDS. Talk about what is good for the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then the gentleman thinks it is all right to leave out the other people in the world?

Mr. RICHARDS. No. I think we should not leave out the other people of the world, but there are plenty of other and more appropriate places to take up their problems. We are talking about the NATO alliance countries, countries to which we are committed and obligated to go to war in the event one of them is attacked.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. So eventually we will have in NATO one group of nations, and then, if the Communists come along, as we have been given to understand they will, and form another group, there will be that other group. Then we will have the whole world in two armed camps, so that each will know where to find its enemies.

Mr. RICHARDS. The whole world is already in two armed camps.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then, what is the use of NATO and the other group that is proposed, if they are all already lined up?

Mr. RICHARDS. We just want those in our camp brought closer together.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Each group will be brought closer together?

Mr. RICHARDS. No; our group.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does not the gentleman think the other group will be brought closer together, too?

Mr. RICHARDS. Maybe.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And then we will know just whom to fight, will we not?

Mr. RICHARDS. They are pretty close already.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to my friend from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. The distinguished group which is to be selected from the other body, can the gentleman tell me whether the members of the Committee on Armed Services will be represented on that group?

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not know about that. The membership of this group which it is expected will be appointed will not be confined to any particular committee. So far as I know, no one from the Committee on Foreign Affairs has signified a desire to go. I hope the members will be appointed from the House at large.

Mr. RIVERS. I think that is a fine way to proceed.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor dealing with school-construction legislation be permitted to sit during debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my full approval and endorsement of the resolution of the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. RICHARDS]. Already 9 or 10 countries, members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the group that has been formed for the purpose of defending each other in the event of aggression against them, have indicated and have signified their intention of sending a delegation to this conference. In fact, in some countries the delegations have been named. If there is going to be another great world war, these countries who will meet in Paris in July of this year will be our allies. Of course, as the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] very well said, this conference will not bind the United States to any action or policy. But it is entirely possible that at this conference there will be discussions on the future of the NATO and there will be an effort to bring the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization closer together.

At the present time NATO is costing the taxpayers of America a great many millions of dollars annually. In my opinion, it will be an economy measure for us to have a delegation there to find out what is going on in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and report back to the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to my colleague. I regret to find that I am not in full agreement with my friend from Iowa, but I am glad to yield to him.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman now saying that we cannot find out what is going on in NATO through the officials already representing this Government in NATO?

Mr. LECOMPTE. There will be representatives of the countries there who will confer and discuss things.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has not answered my question. Can we not find out from the officials already representing us what is going on in NATO?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Yes, we can. But we cannot find out what is the thinking of the men in the parliaments of the member countries. That is what we hope to accomplish at this conference. We are going to find out what are the thoughts of the people in the parliamentary governments who will be represented there.

Mr. GROSS. What does the gentleman propose to find out from them?

Mr. LECOMPTE. There will be a free discussion.

Mr. GROSS. What does the gentleman propose to find out?

Mr. LECOMPTE. If the gentleman is opposed to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, then, of course, he is opposed to this conference. But if the gentleman agrees with the philosophy of those who think we had better have some allies in this next war, if there is going to be one, then he certainly cannot object to this country being represented at that conference.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman's answer is not responsive to my question. What is it the gentleman proposes to find out?

Mr. LECOMPTE. We propose to have an exchange of ideas at the Paris conference. I think that is what the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] who is the author of the resolution, has in mind.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is supporting the resolution. I am asking him the question.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I think he expects to have an exchange of ideas from representatives of these parliamentary governments embraced in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I think the colloquy between the two gentlemen from Iowa may be a little bit wide of the mark. This resolution, as I understand, is for the purpose of permitting discussions of the subject of NATO at the parliamentary level.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Exactly.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Certainly, we can ask the executive branch people who are in charge of these things administratively, but this is for parliamentarians, people like us in the other countries, so that the subject can be discussed at that level.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The gentleman from Oregon is exactly right. That is the purpose of the conference, a discussion by representatives of the parliaments and the Congress meeting together for an exchange of ideas, thereby bringing the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization closer together.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. We are soon going to have discussions on the very highest level. We unquestionably now have numerous discussions on the executive level. But the people in all of the nations of NATO who are responsible for what goes on in their countries are the representatives in the parliamentary bodies of the several governments. This meeting is for the people in the parliamentary branches of the governments to get together and talk things over, too.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It might save the taxpayers of the United States a lot of money.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, these NATO meetings have been going on for a long time. I wonder why at this late date we must have another of these so-called parliamentary groups?

I take this time to ask a few questions and make a few remarks of my own. The gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, says this junket to Paris is designed to impress our viewpoint on someone. May I ask him what viewpoint it is proposed to impress on somebody at this meeting?

Mr. RICHARDS. I would say the viewpoint of the people of the United States in regard to problems relating to the NATO alliance. All the time at these conferences, particularly international conferences, the representatives of particular countries are trying to impress the viewpoint of their particular country on the gathering and thus impress itself upon the North Atlantic alliance. I want representatives to this parliamentary body to be there and, in the event anything comes up that would not be in the best interests of the United States, they could express the viewpoint of our country. That is all.

Mr. GROSS. What is the viewpoint of the people of the United States?

Mr. RICHARDS. There are various views.

Mr. GROSS. Let us get this down to a point where the gentleman can answer it. Some of the Members seem to be amused either by the question or the answer. Do the people of the United States understand that France promised 14½ divisions for NATO? I doubt they have half that number, and most of those are not ready for combat. Do the people of the United States believe the French should at this time withdraw one combat division, meager as are their forces in NATO, and take it down to North Africa to perpetuate their colonial empire? The gentleman can answer that question, and it may not be quite as amusing as some people think it is.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman is not going to attempt to answer that particular question, but I will answer the other one. The gentleman said, "How are we going to impress the viewpoint of the United States?" He followed by saying, "What is the viewpoint of the United States?" I will take the gentleman and myself as illustrations. The gentleman has certain opinions about the North Atlantic Treaty alliance that are different from mine. There are many other opinions in the United States. But I believe, and I have confidence enough in any committee which would be appointed to go over there, that they would not try to impress their individual opinions on those countries but that they would try to impress upon those countries the composite opinion of the legislative body of the United States as well as they could. There is one other angle to this. Not only will we try to impress upon them our viewpoint through these legislative representatives, but we could expect that committee to bring back to this body the viewpoint of the other countries and thus inform this body in that regard.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question then. Is not the viewpoint of the Congress of the United States well known and has it not been well demonstrated by the money which has been voted to implement NATO and by various other actions that have been taken? Is not our viewpoint known to these people? Must we spend $15,000 here to send a bunch of Congressmen junketing to Paris in July of this year?

Mr. RICHARDS. My contention is, may I say to the gentleman, that our viewpoint would be better informed if we

sent a delegation there to come back and report to us.

Mr. GROSS. Which statement does the gentleman elect to adopt here, the statement that these representatives will impress our viewpoint upon these foreigners or that they will obtain more information? Which is it?

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman would just like to have this resolution adopted.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I thought. A trip to Paris.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I would like to ask the chairman how much latitude will the delegates representing the United States have to express their thinking at this meeting.

Mr. RICHARDS. I would assume inasmuch as the gathering would be governed by parliamentary rules of procedure that they would have just as much latitude to express their opinions as the gentleman has here today.

Mr. GAVIN. That is exactly the problem. There will be no restrictions on them to express themselves very forcefully on any subject matter they may care to discuss. I cannot imagine why this legislation comes out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs because the NATO agreement is a military agreement. Why would not this resolution come out of the Committee on Armed Services rather than the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. RICHARDS. The Parliamentarian has control of that.

Mr. GAVIN. I merely want to point out that if anybody going over there could speak their minds freely, it might be productive of excellent results, but if there are certain restrictions placed upon the Members who go on this trip and they are confined because it may be undiplomatic or they may be taking up matters that others think should not be discussed. In other words, as the gentleman pointed out, whoever goes on this trip, can go over there and speak freely, if they care to; is that right? That they can if they care to present their thinking on the support and cooperation that we have received from all of these different NATO countries?

Mr. RICHARDS. So far as I am concerned, I believe I can assure the gentleman they can lay it on the line.

Mr. GAVIN. I was particularly concerned recently over this situation. I noticed in a recent newspaper article, I believe it was, which pointed out that there was some objection on our part, the United States, to using military equipment which we were sending to the NATO countries and which we were giving to France who then, transported that equipment down to north Africa to participate in their situation existing there. Do you know anything about that? Now suppose they brought up a question such as that at the conference?

Mr. RICHARDS. Perhaps this delegation could clear up that situation.

Mr. GAVIN. The State Department evidently did not clear it up because I notice that they made considerable protest about it, but I presume that if we sent someone over there like the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], maybe it would be cleared up and know the reasons why.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] for getting up here and calling our attention to the fact that 14 or 15 or 20 of the best legislators we have are going to leave here in the month of July when we need them to work here, when we have more important legislation than at any other time in the year. Yet they can pick up and go over and talk something over with the Europeans. I think the place for them is here in the House of Representatives and the United States Senate to attend to our business first.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I usually fully agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts, but I cannot agree with him this time. Does the gentleman oppose our people going over there to make that trip?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, this colloquy, particularly the one between the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], points up to me the desirability of this legislation, for one reason. Here in this body we have varying viewpoints. We approach these problems in different aspects, as does the gentleman and myself. This is an opportunity for these legislators who are not hidebound by any policy in the Government to get together and discuss these matters of common interest. It strikes me it would be a good thing for a meeting to be held between the countries at that particular level, apart from the meetings which necessarily occur from time to time among the representatives of the State Department and various foreign agencies.

Mr. GROSS. That same argument has been used for years and years in behalf of the Interparliamentary Union. It is said to be very important that we send a delegation traipsing off each year to all corners of the earth. Of course, as in this case, they point to a very small appropriation. This resolution provides $15,000 each for the House and Senate, a total of $30,000. But probably, like the Interparliamentary Union, a couple of Air Force constellations will be ordered out, and the expense of flying from Washington to Paris will not be figured in the $15,000. It will cost the taxpayers, nevertheless. What results we have obtained from the Interparliamentary Union, I do not know. If the gentleman is prepared to tell me of any real accomplishment on the part of that junketeering outfit I will be glad to hear of it.

Mr. KEATING. Of course, that Interparliamentary Union has no power.

Mr. GROSS. Does this conference have any real power?

Mr. KEATING. I have the impression that this conference would be very weighty in determinations with respect to the Government.

Mr. GROSS. The gentlemen who represent us in the Interparliamentary Union proposition have told us that they were engaged in some very weighty discussions, but I do not believe the gentleman can put his finger on any accomplishments, although we have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on that organization. I simply want to stop this kind of business of spending the taxpayers' money all over the world with no results. I think we ought to get something for the money we are spending.

Now I want to call attention to the resolution. Listen to this wording:

> Whereas the presence of Members of the Congress at the Conference will be a tangible demonstration of the continuing desire of the American people to support the Organization and to promote closer relations with and between the members of the Organization.

A tangible demonstration. We have spent hundreds of millions of dollars on NATO. We have six divisions stationed in Europe at this time in support of NATO, costing us hundreds of millions of dollars every year. What more tangible evidence can we give? Why that language in the resolution? Are we fools or dupes in the House of Representatives, that we should be confronted with a resolution which says we must send a hand-picked crew over to Europe at a cost of at least $30,000, to provide tangible evidence that we are for NATO?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I notice it has been said quite frequently in this colloquy that this will be a splendid way of showing the thoughts of the American people and the different points of view to the people over there all over the world. Does the gentleman think that his point of view is likely to be represented at this Conference?

Mr. GROSS. I know very well it will not be, and the astute gentlewoman knows it will not be.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Briefly.

Mr. JUDD. Of course, this proposed meeting is somewhat like a meeting that was held in Strasbourg in 1951 to which the Congress sent over 6 representatives from the House and 6 from the Senate to meet with representatives of the parliaments of the various nations in the Council of Europe. I happened to be a member of that delegation. Some of the other Members from the House were the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], our former beloved colleague from Georgia, Mr. Cox, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]. You can be sure that, for example, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], was not hesitant in expressing his views on what the attitude of the American people was—some

of it favorable, some unfavorable—with respect to interests we have in common with them.

I felt that meeting where we could take down our hair and talk with them as fellow-legislators, where they could discuss with us their difficulties and problems and opinions, the things on which we could agree and the things on which we disagreed, did more good towards straightening out a lot of misunderstandings than any other single meeting that has been held.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure it did not. It brought no substantial help for us in the Korean war where 35,000 American boys were killed. It brought about no reduction in our foreign handout program. Like others of these conferences, it meant little or nothing.

Mr. JUDD. No, that was in November 1951. It was during the Korean war. We were chiefly discussing our common problems in Europe; we were not discussing the Far East.

Mr. GROSS. Then I will ask the gentleman this question: Where is this junketeering going to end? Is there to be another in conjunction with SEATO?

Mr. JUDD. That might be very useful. Since the Congress of the United States for some years has been appropriating annually approximately $3 billion or a little more for our various mutual security programs around the world, $15,000 is not an unreasonable investment or any waste of the taxpayers' money, when we spend it to enable us who appropriate the money to learn all we can about the purposes and the people for which it is spent.

I do not know anything that could be more valuable, that could give us more experience and background to enable us to legislate wisely in this field, than to sit down around a table with these legislators to discuss these common problems.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not mean to tell me that we have not conferred year after year in Europe. There have been innumerable meetings and to what end?

Mr. JUDD. That is true, but not meeting with their legislators.

Mr. GROSS. The Foreign Affairs Committee, and including the gentleman from Minnesota, the Government Operations Committee, and practically any other committee of Congress that could possibly be interested have had delegations roaming the face of the earth looking into these matters.

Mr. JUDD. There is nothing that can take the place of Members of Congress going over there and sitting down with representatives elected like ourselves by the people of their respective countries and trying to work these things out.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. With respect to a recent conference I can recall several delegates to that conference going over there and taking their wives along with them. They had used Government transportation. No one can tell me there was not some subsidization directly or indirectly with regard to their wives' expenses. I just want to be sure that in this resolution that as to whoever happens to go over on this committee, the Congress will know whether or not they are going to take their wives.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Iowa joins with the gentleman from Mississippi in hoping that the taxpayers will be spared any free loading by the wives of Members who may be designated for this junket. It has been done in the past. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. It is always a pleasure to yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Our good colleague on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] does not want them to take someone else's wife, does he? I am not in favor of that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this resolution because I am convinced, on the basis of other similar deals, that it will mean only a further involvement of the United States in foreign manipulations. It will not relieve the overcommitment of American youth to the fighting of wars all over the globe; it will not relieve overburdened American taxpayers; nor will it help stop deficit spending. On the contrary, it provides for further spending and for no useful purpose.

I reiterate that the sponsors of this resolution have not made a valid case for it. I have no hesitancy in reasserting that it will provide for another free-wheeling junket for some 14 Members of Congress, and perhaps the wives of some if not all of them.

There is no better time to stop some of the waste of the taxpayers' money, and disapproval of this resolution is an excellent place to start. Approval of this resolution will mean that in due time someone will come up with the bright idea that there ought to be a so-called parliamentary conference somewhere in the distant Pacific in connection with SEATO, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

Mr. Speaker, I urge in all sincerity that this resolution be defeated.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the one point I wanted to make at this juncture is this—again and again, the Congress has adopted language in the mutual security legislation, and always initiated in this body, encouraging the economic unification and political federation of Western Europe. Now when the countries there are moving in the direction we ourselves have urged and their elected parliamentary representatives invite us to sit down with them and discuss problems common to all of us in our desire to build security and peace, it is suggested here that we should not do it. Surely no harm and much benefit to both sides can come from such a free and friendly exchange of views. We would not be able, nor would they, to commit our respective governments to any given course of action. But the thing that we are most interested in is the peace and security of the world. Surely the best way and surest way to achieve that is through developing the greatest degree of mutual understanding.

It is said that cur past contributions in money prove our interest. Certainly they do; but there is a good deal more to gaining confidence and good will and understanding than money. The gift without the giver does not generally bear the desired fruit.

Unless some indication and evidence of the views, the spirit, and the attitudes of those who provide the gifts go along with them, our money and arms will fail to produce all the good that we hope for from them. I cannot see one good reason for not adopting this resolution and sending representatives to this conference of the parliaments of the NATO countries. I am not a candidate for the delegation. I am urging this because of the very profitable experience I had at the previous conference of this same general sort and the mutual benefit I felt it had for all concerned.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I am not a candidate either, let that be understood, but it took them 5 years to bring about this NATO organization. What I am interested in is whether or not those who do represent this great country of ours are going to express to these people the American viewpoint; that is, that we have spent billions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money—they are the ones who are making a great sacrifice—and the question whether these countries are going to give us the cooperation that we expected of them when the NATO organization was established, or are they going to continue their dilatory tactics as they have during the past 5 years.

Mr. JUDD. I am unable to accept the implication of what the gentleman has said without replying. If we will look back to conditions as they were when we started this whole aid program in 1947, I think the results are not poor; they are better than any of us had a right or reason to expect. First, the countries individually have recovered remarkably well. Second, they are now making great progress in attacking their problems collectively so that there is steadily increasing strength in the whole of Western Europe. Germany is back on the team as a full partner.

The proof of that strength is the recent shift in tactics by the Kremlin. It has changed from threats and bluster to sweetness and light. Actually this new pose may be more dangerous, because more deceptive than the former one, but surely it is the direct result of the unity and strength NATO is finally developing.

We are right on the threshold of a great forward step that can come if we continue steadfastly on the course of cooperative effort we have been following. The invitation from these countries to closer contacts and consultations at the legislative level is merely another step, a further forward step, in building better understanding. I hope very much

that the House will adopt this resolution.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make two short statements before we vote on the pending resolution.

A few weeks ago General Gruenther came before our committee. He is the Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe. He was asked at that time whether he thought the appointment of this delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Conference would be helpful. He expressed his belief that it would be exceedingly helpful to our military people over there and said he could be quoted to that effect.

The only other reference I want to make to the remarks of the gentleman just a minute ago is in reply to what he said about our spending all of these hundreds of millions of dollars in Europe. That statement is true. For our mutual defense, the Congress has gone down into the pockets of the taxpayers of the United States. It has taken money to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars, even billions, for Europe, most of it in support of the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance countries.

Now, the representatives of the parliamentary bodies of those countries have asked us to join with them and to send a delegation over there to confer, and to discuss common problems in the interests of the maintenance of peace and security in the North Atlantic area. We would not want them to think that we are so disinterested in the use of the money we have spent over there on the alliance that we have with them that we will not send a delegation over there to confer with them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The question I would like to ask the gentleman is, When were hearings held on this bill? I tried to get a copy of the hearings. The gentleman is now quoting General Gruenther as being for this proposition.

Mr. RICHARDS. Hearings were held, and the gentleman was given everything we had on it. The report of the committee was unanimous. No one was denied the opportunity to appear and testify.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman say that hearings were held?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not true that General Gruenther was asked to a hearing on another bill? He commented, as the gentleman has said, on another bill, but General Gruenther did not appear at hearings on this particular resolution.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is correct. Not on this particular resolution.

Mr. VORYS. Does not the gentleman feel, whether we call it laying it on the line or not, that the informal getting together of some of our brethren from the House and Senate with similar people from other countries will permit some of the thorny angles to be talked out and some of the problems, such as the problems of our taxpayers, to be explained to them in a little better way than we could by firing speeches or telegrams or cables across the Atlantic?

Mr. RICHARDS. I think so.

Mr. VORYS. In that way we can really get together in a more effective way.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I think that is an excellent idea. I do not think they have been properly informed as to the sacrifices that the American people have made in producing the money that makes all of these programs possible. They take it for granted, and then there are many times when we may be in disagreement with the policies that they pursue, but we fail to have a representative tell them that we are not in agreement, we seem to acquiesce, we seem to conciliate, we seem to accept. In view of the fact that we have invested these tremendous billions of dollars, we ought to let them know these things.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that two-thirds had voted in favor thereof.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 337, nays 31, not voting 66, as follows:

[Roll No. 89]

YEAS—337

Abbitt	Bolling	Corbett
Abernethy	Bolton,	Coudert
Adair	Frances P.	Cramer
Addonizio	Bonner	Cretella
Albert	Bowler	Crumpacker
Alexander	Boyle	Curtis, Mass.
Allen, Calif.	Bray	Dague
Allen, Ill.	Brooks, La.	Davidson
Andresen,	Brooks, Tex.	Davis, Ga.
August H.	Brown, Ga.	Davis, Wis.
Andrews	Brown, Ohio	Dawson, Ill.
Anfuso	Broyhill	Dawson, Utah
Arends	Buchanan	Deane
Ashley	Budge	Delaney
Ashmore	Burleson	Denton
Aspinall	Burnside	Derounian
Auchincloss	Bush	Devereux
Avery	Byrd	Dixon
Ayres	Byrne, Pa.	Dollinger
Bailey	Byrnes, Wis.	Dolliver
Baker	Cannon	Dondero
Baldwin	Carlyle	Donohue
Barrett	Carnahan	Donovan
Bass, Tenn.	Cederberg	Dorn, N. Y.
Bates	Celler	Dorn, S. C.
Baumhart	Chelf	Doyle
Beamer	Chenoweth	Edmondson
Becker	Chiperfield	Elliott
Bennett, Fla.	Christopher	Ellsworth
Bennett, Mich.	Chudoff	Engle
Bentley	Church	Fallon
Betts	Clark	Fascell
Blatnik	Cole	Feighan
Blitch	Colmer	Fenton
Boggs	Coon	Fernandez
Boland	Cooper	Fine
Fino	Landrum	Richards
Fisher	Lane	Riehlman
Fjare	Lanham	Riley
Flood	Lankford	Rivers
Fogarty	Latham	Roberts
Forand	LeCompte	Robeson, Va.
Ford	Lesinski	Robsion, Ky.
Fountain	Lipscomb	Rodino
Frazier	Long	Rogers, Colo.
Frelinghuysen	Lovre	Rogers, Fla.
Friedel	McCarthy	Rogers, Mass.
Fulton	McConnell	Rogers, Tex.
Garmatz	McCormack	Rooney
Gary	McCulloch	Rutherford
Gathings	McDonough	St. George
Gavin	McDowell	Saylor
George	McIntire	Schenck
Gordon	McMillan	Scherer
Granahan	Macdonald	Schwengel
Grant	Machrowicz	Scott
Gray	Mack, Ill.	Scrivner
Green, Oreg.	Mack, Wash.	Seely-Brown
Gregory	Madden	Selden
Griffiths	Magnuson	Sheehan
Gwinn	Mahon	Sheppard
Hagen	Marshall	Short
Hale	Martin	Shuford
Haley	Matthews	Sieminski
Halleck	Merrow	Simpson, Ill.
Harden	Metcalf	Simpson, Pa.
Hardy	Miller, Md.	Sisk
Harris	Miller, Nebr.	Smith, Miss.
Harrison, Nebr.	Miller, N. Y.	Spence
Harrison, Va.	Mills	Springer
Harvey	Minshall	Staggers
Hays, Ark.	Morano	Steed
Hays, Ohio	Morgan	Sullivan
Hayworth	Moss	Taber
Henderson	Moulder	Talle
Hill	Multer	Taylor
Hillings	Murray, Ill.	Teague, Calif.
Hoffman, Ill.	Murray, Tenn.	Thomas
Holifield	Natcher	Thompson, La.
Holmes	Nelson	Thompson,
Holt	Norblad	Mich.
Holtzman	Norrell	Thompson, N. J.
Hope	O'Brien, Ill.	Thompson, Tex.
Horan	O'Brien, N. Y.	Thomson, Wyo.
Huddleston	O'Hara, Ill.	Thornberry
Hull	O'Neill	Trimble
Hyde	Osmers	Tuck
Ikard	Ostertag	Tumulty
Jarman	Passman	Udall
Jenkins	Patman	Vanik
Jennings	Patterson	Van Zandt
Jenson	Pelly	Vinson
Johnson, Calif.	Perkins	Vorys
Johnson, Wis.	Pfost	Walter
Jonas	Philbin	Watts
Jones, Ala.	Phillips	Weaver
Jones, Mo.	Pilcher	Westland
Judd	Pillion	Whitten
Karsten	Poage	Wickersham
Kean	Poff	Widnall
Keating	Powell	Wigglesworth
Kee	Preston	Williams, N. J.
Kelley, Pa.	Price	Willis
Keogh	Priest	Wilson, Calif.
Kilburn	Quigley	Wilson, Ind.
Kilday	Rabaut	Winstead
Kilgore	Radwan	Wolverton
King, Calif.	Rains	Wright
King, Pa.	Ray	Yates
Kirwan	Reed, Ill.	Young
Klein	Rees, Kans.	Zablocki
Kluczynski	Reuss	Zelenko
Knox	Rhodes, Ariz.	
Laird	Rhodes, Pa.	

NAYS—31

Andersen,	Forrester	O'Konski
H. Carl	Gentry	Sikes
Berry	Gross	Siler
Bosch	Hoeven	Smith, Kans.
Bow	Hoffman, Mich.	Smith, Wis.
Burdick	Johansen	Utt
Clevenger	Jones, N. C.	Van Pelt
Cunningham	Krueger	Williams, Miss.
Dies	Mason	Williams, N. Y.
Dowdy	Nicholson	Withrow
Flynt	O'Hara, Minn.	

NOT VOTING—66

Alger	Cooley	Hébert
Barden	Curtis, Mo.	Herlong
Bass, N. H.	Davis, Tenn.	Heselton
Belcher	Dempsey	Hess
Bell	Diggs	Hiestand
Bolton,	Dingell	Hinshaw
Oliver P.	Dodd	Hosmer
Boykin	Durham	Jackson
Brownson	Eberharter	James
Buckley	Evins	Kearney
Canfield	Gamble	Kearns
Carrigg	Green, Pa.	Kelly, N. Y.
Chase	Gubser	Knutson
Chatham	Hand	McGregor

McVey	Reece, Tenn.	Velde
Maillliard	Reed, N. Y.	Vursell
Meader	Roosevelt	Wainwright
Miller, Calif.	Sadlak	Wharton
Mollohan	Scudder	Wier
Morrison	Shelley	Wolcott
Mumma	Smith, Va.	Younger
Polk	Teague, Tex.	
Prouty	Tollefson	

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Hand.
Mr. Dodd with Mr. Scudder.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Gubser.
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Polk with Mr. McVey.
Mrs. Knutson with Mr. Prouty.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. James.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Carrigg.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Brownson.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Heselton.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Jackson.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Wainwright.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Younger.
Mr. Wier with Mr. Maillliard.

Mr. BOW changed his vote from "aye" to "nay."

Mr. GEORGE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

By unanimous consent, House Resolution 275 was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, after the call of bills on the Private Calendar tomorrow and before the consideration of the bill H. R. 4663, two conference reports will be considered, one on H. R. 103 relating to reclamation projects and the other on H. R. 2126, with reference to the utilization of saline waters, and so forth. It is my understanding that these conference reports are unanimous. They will be considered tomorrow.

AMENDING TRAVEL EXPENSE ACT OF 1949

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6295) to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, and for other purposes, as amended by the committee.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 166, as amended; 5 U. S. C. 836) is further amended by striking "$9" and inserting in lieu thereof "$13"; and by striking the period at the end thereof and adding the following additional proviso: " : *And provided further*, That where due to the unusual circumstances of a travel assignment within the limits of the continental United States such maximum per diem allowance would be much less than the amount required to meet the actual and necessary expenses of the trip, the heads of departments and establishments may, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Director, Bureau of the Budget, pursuant to section 7, prescribe conditions under which reimbursement for such expenses may be authorized on an actual expense basis not to exceed a maximum amount to be specified in the travel authorization, but in any event not to exceed $25 for each day in travel status."

SEC. 2. Section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 808; 5 U. S. C. 73b–2) is amended by striking "$10 per diem" and inserting in lieu thereof "$15 per diem within the limits of the continental United States and beyond such limits, not to exceed the rates of per diem established by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget pursuant to section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 836)"; and by striking the period at the end thereof and adding the following additional proviso: " : *And provided further*, That where due to the unusual circumstances of a travel assignment within the limits of the continental United States such maximum per diem allowance would be much less than the amount required to meet the actual and necessary expenses of the trip, the heads of departments and establishments may, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Director, Bureau of the Budget, pursuant to section 7 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949 as amended (5 U. S. C. 840) prescribe conditions under which reimbursement for such expenses may be authorized on an actual expense basis not to exceed a maximum amount to be specified in the travel authorization, but in any event not to exceed $25 for each day in travel status.".

SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 1823 (a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking the portion "and if travel is made by privately owned automobile mileage at a rate not to exceed 7 cents per mile, together with a per diem allowance not to exceed $9 in lieu of subsistence" and inserting in lieu thereof "or, if travel is made by privately owned automobile, at a rate not to exceed that prescribed in section 4 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, together with a per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence not to exceed the rates of per diem as described in, or established pursuant to, section 3 thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for 20 minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, this bill deals with increasing the per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses of all regular Government employees; and those who might be in the service of the Government without compensation in a consultative capacity.

The bill deals specifically with the Travel Expense Act of 1949 and the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946. It raises the per diem allowance from $9 to $13 for the regular Government employees.

A new provision has been added which takes care of special cases where expenses might be considerably higher and it provides that in those cases under regulations promulgated by the head of the department and the Bureau of the Budget an actual cost basis of not to exceed $25 per day may be used.

For those persons who are not compensated by the Government, this act raises their per diem from $10 per day to $15 per day, and also carries a new provision providing for an actual cost basis to take care of special cases, not to exceed $25 per day.

The third section of the bill deals with a provision of the law which is now in a separate act. It has to do with travel expenses for civilian employees who are necessary as witnesses for the United States Government and puts their per diem at the same rate; that is, increases it from $9 to $13 a day. The committee considered but did not touch and this legislation does not affect the mileage allowance for the use of vehicles.

This report came out of the subcommittee unanimously and was reported by the full Committee on Government Operations unanimously except for reservations made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

This was requested and has been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and all of the departments of Government that have occasion to use the per diem. It is recommended also by all of the employee groups.

We had before us several bills. One was a bill introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], another was a bill introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHUDOFF], and another bill by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW]. This bill represents a combination of all those bills which provided anywhere from $12 to $15 per diem. Those bills, or at least some of them, also dealt with an increase in the mileage allowance.

The testimony is clear that the increase in the cost of travel is sufficient to warrant the $13 recommended by the committee. There is no great objection to the measure. It is necessary in view of the increase in subsistence from 1949 to the present date. Therefore I urge that the rules be suspended and the bill be passed.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I have had some complaints by employees in the thickly populated areas where the parking facilities are very costly. Is there any provision for a Government employee to include in his expense account parking facilities?

Mr. FASCELL. The increase provided for incidental expenses and it was taken into consideration in the allowance of this maximum of $13 a day. There is also the further provision, this new proviso which has been added, that takes care of those exceptional cases for which allowances can be made under regulations of the department heads and the Bureau of the Budget. That would take care of that matter.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I wonder, sir, if you can estimate how much of the expense comes under the allowance up to the $25 per diem? Has the gentleman any record of past expenditures to show what proportion that would be of the total amount of Government expenses?

Mr. FASCELL. I do not have any record and I do not know that any was given to us. In each case the $13 is a maximum amount and in each case the $25 would be a maximum amount. The departments do operate on the actual cost basis. We had testimony before the committee that in a great many cases, in fact the majority of the cases, the actual expenditures would be above the $9 provided in the present law.

Mrs. CHURCH. Would the actual expenses therein computed cover any expenditures except for board and lodging? What would be the other items included?

Mr. FASCELL. It would cover incidental expenses such as tips and fees, laundry, dry cleaning and so forth.

Mrs. CHURCH. And traveling within the place visited?

Mr. FASCELL. Yes.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Our subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on the Treasury heard testimony on several occasions that the Secret Service officers who are under the Treasury, when traveling with the President to protect the President have to stop at the same hotels the President stops at, which usually or frequently are expensive hotels; and that in the past they have been forced to pay the high hotel rates out of their own pockets because the allowance was not sufficient to take care of them. Would the $25 limit be applied in that case and could they be compensated for their actual expenses up to $25?

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman is correct, and the answer is in the affirmative.

Mr. GARY. Is that the purpose of the bill?

Mr. FASCELL. That is the purpose of the new proviso.

Mr. GARY. Of the new proviso. That is what I mean.

Mr. FASCELL. Yes. In fact, our committee also heard testimony on the same point, and that is the main reason why this proviso was included in the bill, to correct that inequitable situation.

Mr. GARY. I want to commend the committee for placing that proviso in the bill, because I think it is a very necessary proviso. I think it is not proper for the Government to require these men in the discharge of their duties to live at hotels of that kind and not pay their full expenses.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for his statement in corroboration of this committee's report.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the Speaker and the Members of the House for any confused ideas I might put forth, because the thought I had in mind I lost while yielding to unanimous consent requests—so those making them might get away. However, I do want to compliment my colleague on the committee for the very clear and factual statement which he made. He gave you an accurate idea of what this bill proposes to do. He stated that all of the representatives of the departments who came up to the hearing were in favor this bill. Was there anything strange about that? Why should they not be? He said that all of the representatives of all of the organizations representing Federal employees were in favor of the bill. No reason why they should not be. And, I assume that all of the employees who would benefit are in favor of the bill. I do not know of any who are against it. I did not hear of any. But, in the hearings that were held I did not hear one single word from anyone, unless it was your humble servant, who spoke in the interest of the taxpayer.

Now, if the gentleman could tell me or the House what the estimated cost of this raise will be, I will be very glad to hear it. I heard no testimony as to the number of employees overall who would receive this increase. I heard no testimony that was accurate as to the total of the dollars required to meet the cost if the bill goes through. So, here we are. And in looking at the noon paper a moment ago in an idle moment I noticed the statement that the amount which would be added to the national debt because of the deficit we are incurring would be $10 billion. Think of that now before you vote to appropriate more money to further increase that debt.

One other thing. The Federal employees who will receive this added benefit knew what the job was when they took it. They knew what each job paid. They expected there would be certain expenses along the line.

The gentleman referred to the hotels where those who guard the President are required to stay and to pay a comparatively high rate. Is there any reason why that amount should not be allowed to the President as a part of the necessary expenses of the Executive? The President's expenses are taken care of in an appropriation and these men's expenses can well be paid from that fund. I know of no way of giving it to them directly, but we provide our Intelligence Service with certain sums for which they do not need to account. That has been the practice for years. All of us realize the necessity for that. In such a case we are bound to trust those who have authority to approve such expenditures as are proper. There is no objection to that.

But here we have a bill which increases, for no one knows how many employees, the daily expense allowance by $4—from $9 to $13. Some may not be familiar with this practice. A Federal employee lives in Baltimore. He or she comes to Washington for the day's work. He charges up $13, or will if this bill passes. At present he or she charges up $9 which is paid by the Government. Perhaps some other employee lives in Washington or lives somewhere else in Maryland and he goes to some other city, such as Baltimore, someplace away from home. They will be able to charge up an additional $13 a day if this bill passes. The passage of this bill is an invitation not to live where you are working. It is an invitation to Federal employees to travel to work away from home. That is what it is.

When this bill was up it just chanced that an employer from my district who operates a factory was here seeking Government business. He is in charge of the sales agency of his organization and it is not a very small one. It is not as large as General Motors, nowhere near that, but it is a fairly decent-sized business. He was looking for me, so he was sent up to the committee, where I was and he listened to some of the testimony. When we walked out at the time of the recess, he shook his head and said, "Say, Clare, are they going to allow that? That would break us. Our sales force does not have an expense allowance like that." There you have it. Oh, I know how easy it is to build up a story. But let me tell you a little of my experiences—not about my operation, because I never had one, but about my experience on a trip for the Government. I went to Detroit on a hearing with one of our subcommittees. Do you know what happened? I got a room in the best hotel in Detroit, so reported to me, for $6.50. Then what happened? Someone—I will not state his political faith or whether he was or was not a member of the committee—someone said to me: "You cannot do that. Some of the members of our committee have rooms at $12 and $12.50. You have got to put in a bill that will compare with the rest of them."

It was not such a bad room. I have slept in worse places, in respectable homes and elsewhere. It was a small room, with a shower, a single bed—surely. Was not it all right? This was on Government business. I am not much for style nor for "putting on the dog" as some put it. It was the kind of a room I would use if I had been traveling on my own. Do you know what happened? Everybody on that committee was supposed to get a $12 room. Just to sleep in.

I do not think that is the way to do business for Uncle Sam. I do not believe these Federal employees are in such hard straits. If they were, they would not accept their jobs. It is like this postal-pay

bill. I voted for the increase. It seems to be an administration measure. A vote for the bill was a vote to prevent a greater increase in conference. I wanted to go along with the President if I could. I thought it was fair. So I voted for it. But do you know, in my district, every time there is a vacancy in a postal job, I have 4 or 5 applicants for the job. If I understand the situation correctly, people are waiting to get on the Federal payroll. That does not indicate to me that the jobs are no good, undesirable.

So why, when the Government is going into debt on the farm program at the rate of a million dollars a day—and there was another item that I read of another million-dollar-a-day deficit; I have forgotten what it is—and we are told in the papers that the national debt at the end of this year will jump $10 billion with an interest charge of—how much? Some of you mathematicians can figure it out quicker than I can—is there any reason why we should make these jobs pay more? Add another half-billion to the debt each year? It sure means more taxes. I cannot see it. I hope someday we will get around to the goal that the President has set. He was going to balance the budget, and he was going to reduce the national debt. And we were to have lower taxes. That promise of economy is the same promise that Franklin Delano Roosevelt made us in his first campaign. and we have all made it separately. And so far as I can recall—and if I am wrong I hope you will correct me—neither the executive department nor the Congress from that date to this has made any worthwhile effort to fulfill that promise.

And we are off on a wild, uncontrolled spending spree.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. What maximum did you provide in this bill? The Bureau of the Budget is authorized to pay only actual expenses spent for the day and not the maximum, so that, after all, if the Bureau of the Budget is going to check these accounts for the actual amount spent, they are not going to get the maximum.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman know where the Bureau of the Budget ever cut down a bill? Did the gentleman hear what the gentleman in charge of the bill said it was to include? I understood him to say laundry and dry cleaning, which is something that our own Disbursing Officer will not O. K. when we stick in a bill for expenses.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Of course, it is an invitation to stay at the $12 hotels or the $15 hotels because the maximum has been raised.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There was one investigator that our own committee had. I said, "Look, George," and he was the son of a millionaire, too, but he told me, "I have got to get a job. I have only $33,000 left in the bank." Of course, if I had had $33,000 I would have retired, but he did not want to; he stayed on. He came in with a bill for me to O. K. He had $5—I almost fainted—$5 for breakfast. I said "George, for heaven's sake, what did you have?" He said, "It wasn't what I had, it was where I had it. I had it brought up to my room in the Blackstone Hotel in Chicago." "Why did you have breakfast in bed?" I said. He said, "I didn't feel like going down." I said, "You are through with this committee." And he is a nice fellow. It was just natural, you know, for him to have breakfast in bed, but some of the taxpayers who helped pay for the breakfast in bed were up long before breakfast trying to get their share of the tax dollars to the tax collector. There is no justice in forcing some workers to get up before daylight so some Federal employee can have breakfast in bed.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. Can the gentleman tell us the total average annual cost of Federal transportation for Federal employees?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman was not listening when I started, because I asked the gentleman in charge of the bill, and I guess I am right about it, and he can correct me if I am not, for the total cost, and the answer was to the effect that there was no evidence before the committee as to, for example, the number of miles, the days traveled, the number of employees, so it is an impossibility to tell how many billions this measure will cost if it goes through. I will venture it does not cost the school children, the representatives of the 4–H, or the lobbyists who come down here for the CIO, the A. F. of L., or the farmers—I venture to say it does not cost them $13 a day for subsistance.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How much time does the gentleman want? I want to yield some time to someone who wants to talk on the bill. We have plenty of time today even though we did not last Thursday.

Mr. BUDGE. I just want time enough to remark that I favor the gentleman's position on this legislation. Every appropriation I have seen, in the justifications for travel the expense item is a terrific amount of money. I rather think that perhaps raising the per diem will be an incentive for more travel. For that reason, I do not think you can even begin to compute what the total cost is to the Federal Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am sure we cannot. These expense bills are like snowballs going down hill. If anybody else wants to be yielded time, I will be glad to do it. There is no discussion under the 5-minute rule under this procedure.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. The Bureau of Budget estimated that the additional cost to the Government due to the increase in the per diem from $9 to $13 would not exceed $30 million.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, but they did not have any estimate or any accurate information as to the number of people who are traveling, and they could not have, so they could not tell us how much the bill will come to—they give what they call an estimate. It is just one of those "Give us some more" things, that is all. No one knows or could even approximate accurately the cost. So if you want to go for it, that is your business, not mine.

I would like to do, as well as say, something that will help convince the people that a campaign promise is something more than campaign oratory.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, ever since I have been connected with the legislative process, I have always heard the hue and cry "Let's kill the legislation because of the abuses that might be possible." Well, I am going to be different from my very able and witty colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, and I am going to assume that people are honest until they are proven guilty. There is no denying it, and the evidence is complete in the report of the hearings, if you want to take the time to examine it, that inequities exist when you require Government employees to travel pursuant to their job and when you require civilians who are needed by the Government of the United States to testify at trials and when you require these special agents to go out on missions where they have to spend over and above the amount of money that is authorized; and where you call in highly specialized people to serve without compensation and you pay them their per diem. As far as the total cost of travel is concerned, of course, it cannot be computed on the basis per person because each person travels to a different place and expenses are at a different rate and therefore cost per person varies. You, therefore, have to take the total cost and average it out. And that is the reason the Bureau of the Budget estimated the total cost of this bill would not exceed $30 million. The total cost of travel including subsistence is $174 million, 50 percent of which is actually travel costs, and 50 percent is the cost of subsistence.

One other point, my able colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, is crying about the budget. I think his position is somewhat inconsistent as he himself points out, because he voted for the postal pay raise bill. He also voted for the bill, S. 67, just a moment ago, which appropriates $326 million, and now he says, "Oh, that is fine but this bill under consideration is going to make it impossible to balance the budget so, therefore, I am against it." He says this despite the fact that the Government requires employees to travel in the course of their employment and that the evidence before the committee was clear and substantial that the present rate of $9 is inadequate and inequitable. I submit that my distinguished colleague, whose remarks as so pointed and witty is attempting to reprimand the entire

Congress at the expense of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if nobody else wants to use the time, I will. Permit me to say to the speaker that we have recovered from our hurry of last Thursday when we were forced to get through with the bill so that we could have Friday, Saturday, and Sunday off. For the benefit of the Thursday to Tuesday club permit me to add I think it would be well to stay here and spend a little more time on this and other bills, then adjourn not later than July 4. I just do not appreciate the statement of my colleague on the committee that I do not have any confidence in human nature. I have lived longer than my colleague and I may be twice, or perhaps three times, as old as he is and the longer I live, the more honest people I find. The percentage of those who are honest and decent and loyal and patriotic, I find is going up all the time, but always—you know when the Lord was crucified there was one fellow there who just would not repent—do you remember that—well, now, there are still a few, and it is only human nature to try to get what you can, and these Government jobs are desirable, especially so under present conditions. It appears to me that once having secured a Federal job, you cannot be discharged for any reason—you just cannot be discharged.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mrs. CHURCH. I want to tell the gentleman first that I always appreciate his respect for the financial solvency of this country, and I am asking my question sincerely. Would the gentleman tell us in setting up his budget on the basis of $6.50 a night, how he would spend the remaining $2.50 of the presently allowed $9 per diem? Does that cover three meals and incidental expenses?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I just do not recall what I had for breakfast, but I will say to the gentlewoman that ordinarily it is one soft-boiled egg and a slice of toast. At noon, ordinarily, it is two doughnuts and a cup of coffee. In the evening, being on a diet, and not because of my figure or anything of that nature, but because I may have too much sugar in my blood, it is again two eggs and a slice of toast—and I seem to be as healthy as the average Member of the House. That is the way that is. Now everyone to his taste. Had I been born an aristocrat like my colleague with blue blood and all, I might not be able to get along on $6 or $9 a day, but I manage to get along. I hope St. Peter will forgive me for my sins and take me in where I will be permitted to enjoy the society of my betters.

All I am trying to do is to protect the aching back of some of the folks who just do not have very much and have to work very, very hard to meet the taxes we impose on them.

For example, down at the filling station, where I went night before last. He was a fine young man—a colored fellow—he had only six children and a wife. He said:

> Do you know, Mr. HOFFMAN, I am having trouble getting enough to eat for my family?

He said:

> They have not had a steak in I don't know how long. We get along on stews and soup bones.

He has to pay taxes too. I think he would like a Government job with $13 a day to spend for meals for himself. Then, of course, he would have relief for the family, and perhaps social security.

I apologize for opposing this bill. I do that because of the views of my distinguished colleague from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Let us have a rollcall.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes. The gentleman says we should vote, and I think we should.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER].

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I enjoy listening to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. His talks are always very instructive, humorous, and to the point, but you know he is finally learning one thing, and he is not alone in accumulating that knowledge. The Republican Party is finding out that it takes money to run the Federal Government; that it is difficult to balance the budget, and that it is hard to reduce taxes.

Several gentlemen from his side of the aisle, when we had a Democratic administration, used to say that we Democrats just ran the Government into debt; spent money hand over fist, just because we wanted to.

But the present administration is learning that it takes a lot of money to run the Federal Government. And why should it not? It is the greatest business in the world. I am not finding fault with the Republican Party because they have spent a lot of money running this Government. I knew they would have to do it when they were elected. It was no surprise to me. We Democrats are willing for them to have it. So that if they do not do a good job they cannot say it is because the Democrats did not let them have enough money to do a good job. We shall go along.

Now, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] referred to what the American farmer was costing the Federal Government. I would like to refer for a moment to what this administration is costing the American farmer. The latest figures of the Department of Agriculture are to the effect that the farmer's land and buildings are worth $2 billion less than they were 3 years ago. The value of his cattle is $4 billion less than it was 3 years ago. That means $6 billion. His hogs are worth $2 billion less than they were 3 years ago. That makes $8 billion. His poultry and his grain and his cotton and his dairy products are worth another $2 billion less than they were 3 years ago.

So, while the American farmer is costing the Federal Government a little money for storage of farm commodities that we will need if we ever get into war, and that the world needs now this present administration is costing the American farmer—has already cost him since the beginning of this administration—$10 billion; and I want to tell you I think they come pretty high. This administration is not worth it to me. If marketing quotas on wheat are voted down, and the Secretary of Agriculture is doing nothing to support the program, we will see wheat selling for less than $1 per bushel in 1956. But Mr. Benson says agriculture is leveling off; that we farmers should cheer up; farm prices will only sink another 5 to 10 percent again next year, and it is his intention to reduce the support level even lower.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Florida that the rules be suspended and that the bill be passed.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced that in the opinion of the Chair two-thirds had voted in the affirmative.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present and object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 320, nays 41, not voting 73, as follows:

[Roll No. 90]

YEAS—320

Abbitt	Byrd	Feighan
Abernethy	Byrne, Pa.	Fenton
Adair	Byrnes, Wis.	Fernandez
Addonizio	Cannon	Fine
Albert	Carlyle	Fino
Allen, Calif.	Carnahan	Fisher
Allen, Ill.	Cederberg	Fjare
Andersen, H. Carl	Celler	Flood
Andrews	Chase	Fogarty
Anfuso	Chelf	Forand
Arends	Chenoweth	Ford
Ashley	Chiperfield	Forrester
Ashmore	Christopher	Fountain
Aspinall	Chudoff	Frazier
Auchincloss	Church	Frelinghuysen
Avery	Clark	Friedel
Ayres	Cole	Fulton
Baker	Cooper	Gary
Baldwin	Corbett	Gathings
Bass, Tenn.	Coudert	Gavin
Bates	Cramer	Gordon
Baumhart	Crumpacker	Granahan
Beamer	Cunningham	Grant
Becker	Curtis, Mass.	Gray
Bennett, Fla.	Dague	Green, Oreg.
Bennett, Mich.	Davidson	Gregory
Bentley	Davis, Ga.	Griffiths
Betts	Davis, Wis.	Gwinn
Blatnik	Dawson, Utah	Hagen
Blitch	Deane	Hale
Boggs	Delaney	Haley
Boland	Denton	Halleck
Bolling	Derounian	Harden
Bolton, Frances P.	Devereux	Hardy
Bonner	Dies	Harris
Bosch	Dixon	Harrison, Nebr.
Bowler	Dollinger	Harrison, Va.
Boykin	Dolliver	Harvey
Boyle	Dondero	Hays, Ark.
Bray	Donohue	Hays, Ohio
Brooks, La.	Donovan	Henderson
Brooks, Tex.	Dorn, N. Y.	Hill
Brown, Ga.	Dowdy	Hillings
Brown, Ohio	Doyle	Hoeven
Buchanan	Edmondson	Holifield
Burdick	Elliott	Holmes
Burleson	Ellsworth	Holt
Burnside	Engle	Holtzman
	Evins	Hope
	Fascell	Horan

Huddleston	Morano	Schwengel
Hull	Morgan	Scott
Hyde	Moss	Seely-Brown
Ikard	Moulder	Selden
Jarman	Multer	Sheehan
Jenkins	Murray, Ill.	Sheppard
Jennings	Natcher	Short
Johnson, Calif.	Nelson	Shuford
Johnson, Wis.	Nicholson	Sieminski
Jonas	Norblad	Sikes
Jones, Ala.	O'Brien, Ill	Simpson, Ill.
Jones, Mo.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Simpson, Pa.
Judd	O'Hara, Ill.	Sisk
Karsten	O'Hara, Minn.	Smith, Miss.
Kean	O'Neill	Spence
Keating	Ostertag	Springer
Kee	Passman	Staggers
Kelley, Pa.	Patman	Steed
Keogh	Patterson	Sullivan
Kilday	Pelly	Talle
Kilgore	Perkins	Teague, Calif.
King, Calif.	Pfost	Teague, Tex.
Kirwan	Philbin	Thomas
Klein	Phillips	Thompson, La.
Kluczynski	Pilcher	Thompson, Mich.
Knutson	Pillion	Thompson, N. J.
Laird	Poage	Thompson, Tex.
Landrum	Powell	Thomson, Wyo.
Lane	Preston	Thornberry
Lanham	Price	Trimble
Lankford	Priest	Tuck
Latham	Quigley	Tumulty
Lesinski	Rabaut	Utt
Lipscomb	Radwan	Vanik
Long	Rains	Van Pelt
Lovre	Ray	Van Zandt
McCarthy	Reed, Ill.	Vinson
McConnell	Rees, Kans.	Vorys
McCormack	Reuss	Watts
McDonough	Rhodes, Pa.	Westland
McIntire	Richards	Whitten
McMillan	Riehlman	Wickersham
Macdonald	Riley	Widnall
Machrowicz	Rivers	Wigglesworth
Mack, Ill.	Roberts	Williams, N. J.
Mack, Wash.	Robeson, Va.	Willis
Madden	Robsion, Ky.	Wilson, Calif.
Magnuson	Rodino	Wilson, Ind.
Mahon	Rogers, Colo.	Winstead
Martin	Rogers, Fla.	Withrow
Matthews	Rogers, Mass.	Wolverton
Merrow	Rogers, Tex.	Wright
Metcalf	Rooney	Yates
Miller, Md.	Rutherford	Young
Miller, N. Y.	St. George	Zablocki
Mills	Saylor	Zelenko
Minshall	Schenck	
Mollohan	Scherer	

NAYS—41

Alexander	Gross	Miller, Nebr.
Andresen, August H.	Hayworth	Murray, Tenn.
	Hoffman, Mich.	Norrell
Berry	Jensen	O'Konski
Bow	Johansen	Poff
Budge	Jones, N. C.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bush	Kilburn	Scrivner
Clevenger	King, Pa.	Siler
Colmer	Knox	Smith, Kans.
Coon	Krueger	Taber
Dorn, S. C.	LeCompte	Vursell
Flynt	McCulloch	Weaver
Gentry	Marshall	Williams, Miss.
George	Mason	Williams, N. Y.

NOT VOTING—73

Alger	Eberharter	Miller, Calif.
Bailey	Fallon	Morrison
Barden	Gamble	Mumma
Barrett	Garmatz	Osmers
Bass, N. H.	Green, Pa.	Polk
Belcher	Gubser	Prouty
Bell	Hand	Reece, Tenn.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hébert	Reed, N. Y.
	Herlong	Roosevelt
Brownson	Heselton	Sadlak
Broyhill	Hess	Scudder
Buckley	Hiestand	Shelley
Canfield	Hinshaw	Smith, Va.
Carrigg	Hoffman, Ill.	Smith, Wis.
Chatham	Hosmer	Taylor
Cooley	Jackson	Tollefson
Cretella	James	Udall
Curtis, Mo.	Kearney	Velde
Davis, Tenn.	Kearns	Wainwright
Dawson, Ill.	Kelly, N. Y.	Walter
Dempsey	McDowell	Wharton
Diggs	McGregor	Wier
Dingell	McVey	Wolcott
Dodd	Mailliard	Younger
Durham	Meader	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Wier with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Hand.
Mr. Dodd with Mr. Scudder.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. McGregor.
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. McVey.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Prouty.
Mr. Polk with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. James.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Hosmers.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Heselton.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Carrigg.
Mr. Bailey with Mr. Broyhill.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Wainwright.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Dawson of Illinois with Mr. Cretella.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Hiestand.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Younger.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Jackson.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Brownson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSING INVESTIGATION

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 204) to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 203, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 203, 84th Congress, incurred by the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $75,000, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of accountants, experts, investigators, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee, or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Like 10, strike out "or subcommittee."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. This resolution is to implement House Resolution 203, which was approved by the House, and which provides for an investigation of the housing problems; is that not true?

Mr. BURLESON. That is true.

Mr. LECOMPTE. And we believe the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], who sponsored it, will have charge of the investigations?

Mr. BURLESON. That is my understanding.

Mr. LECOMPTE. He has furnished a budget of his planned investigations?

Mr. BURLESON. His budget was submitted to the committee and approved by the committee.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEDICATING LEE MANSION AS A PERMANENT MEMORIAL TO ROBERT E. LEE.

Mr. BURLESON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 41) to authorize the enrollment with certain changes of Senate Joint Resolution 62, dedicating the Lee Mansion in Arlington National Cemetery as a permanent memorial to Robert E. Lee.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 62) dedicating the Lee Mansion in Arlington National Cemetery as a permanent memorial to Robert E. Lee, to make the following changes, namely: On page 2, line No. 1, of the engrossed joint resolution, strike out the word *"Resolved"* and in lieu thereof insert *"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled"*; on page 2, line 8, strike out "; and be it further" and insert a period; on page 2, line 9, strike out *"Resolved,"* and insert "SEC. 2."; on page 3, line 2, strike out "; and be it further" and insert a period; and on line 1 of the House engrossed amendment strike out *"Resolved,"* and insert "SEC. 3.".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman inform us what the change by the other body was?

Mr. BURLESON. Actually, this is a correction rather than an amendment. Originally, in the resolving clause, the Senate resolution simply used the word "Resolved" and in the pending resolution the words "Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled" is substituted, thus, making it a concurrent resolution. The language is simply corrective rather than an amendment.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE HONORABLE JAMES M. HAZLETT

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution (H. Res. 269) authorizing payment of salary due to James M. Hazlett, deceased, be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I submit a committee report, and I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD after the legislative proceedings of today the unclassified portions of the text of the agreements for cooperation published in the RECORD.

I also ask in this connection to extend and revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, from time to time the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has published in the RECORD the text of the agreements for cooperation which the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 require to come before that committee. On Wednesday June 15, the Atomic Energy Commission deposited with the joint committee its proposed Agreements for Cooperation with the United Kingdom, with Canada, and with Belgium, relating to the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

On June 15, the Department of Defense also deposited with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy its proposed Agreements for Cooperation with the United Kingdom and with Canada relating to mutual defense plans.

Hearings on all of these agreements are scheduled for the immediate future before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the joint committee will give very careful consideration to these agreements.

Today I would like to ask unanimous consent to have the unclassified portions of the text of these agreements for cooperation published in the RECORD.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy through its Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation has held hearings on the proposed Agreements for Cooperation with Turkey, Brazil and Colombia. Under these agreements the United States proposes to cooperate with each country in the erection of a research reactor in the other country. A report of the joint committee on these three agreements for cooperation has been made. The joint committee finds that these three Agreements for Cooperation with Turkey, with Brazil, and with Colombia are in conformance with the spirit and letter of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

I herewith submit the report:

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA

The Government of the United States of America, represented by the United States Atomic Energy Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), and the Government of Canada, through its wholly-owned Corporations, Eldorado Mining and Refining Limited and Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, have for several years been engaged in atomic energy programs within their respective countries and from the inception of these programs have collaborated closely in certain areas. The principal objective of Canada's atomic energy program is the civil use of atomic energy and, in particular, the use of atomic energy as a source of electric energy. The objective of the atomic energy program in the United States is twofold: (1) the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, and (2) the use of atomic energy for defense purposes. There exists a unique tradition of cooperation between Canada and the United States. Based on similar national interests, this cooperation produces special industrial and economic inter-relationships. Consequently, progress in each country toward the full benefits of the peaceful uses of atomic energy will be accelerated through an arrangement which is consistent with the cooperation existing in other areas. Accordingly, the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, the parties to this Agreement, agree, as provided herein, to assist each other in the achievement of the objectives of their respective atomic energy programs to the extent such assistance is relevant to current or projected programs and subject to applicable laws of the respective governments and the availabiility of material and personnel. While for the present and for the foreseeable future priority of materials and personnel must be given to defense needs, an increasing number of opportunities exist for the development of the peaceful applications of atomic energy. It is expressly understood that the design, fabrication, disposition, or utilization of atomic weapons are outside the scope of this Agreement.

ARTICLE I—PERIOD OF AGREEMENT

This Agreement shall enter into force on the date of receipt by the Government of Canada of a notification from the Government of the United States of America that the peroid of thirty days required by Section 123c of the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954 has elapsed, and it shall remain in force through July 31, 1965.

ARTICLE II—EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION

Classified and unclassified information will be exchanged between the Commission and the appropriate agencies of the Government of Canada with respect to the application of of atomic energy to peaceful uses, including research and development relating thereto, and including problems of health and safety. There are set forth in this Article the specific fields in which classified information will be exchanged. The exchange of information provided for in this Article will be accomplished through the various means available, including reports, conferences, and visits to facilities.

A. Limitations

Of the information which is classified, only that relevant to current or projected programs will be exchanged. The parties to the Agreement will not exchange Restricted Data under this Agreement which, in the opinion of either country, is primarily of military significance, or exchange Restricted Data relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons. Within the subject matter of this Agreement, the parties may come into possession of privately developed and privately owned information and information received from other governments which the parties are not permitted to exchange.

It is mutually understood and agreed that, except as limitations are stated to apply specifically to one party or the other, any limitations to cooperation imposed pursuant to this Agreement shall be reciprocal.

B. Reactors

(1) Information on the development, design, construction, operation and use of research, production, experimental power, demonstration power, and power reactors, except as provided in Paragraph A and (2) and (3) of this paragraph.

(2) The development of submarine, ship, aircraft, and certain package power reactors is presently concerned primarily with their military uses. Accordingly, it is agreed that the parties to this Agreement will not communicate to each other under this agreement Restricted Data pertaining primarily to such reactors, until such time as these types of reactors warrant civil application, and as the exchange of information on these types of reactors may be mutually agreed. Restricted Data pertaining to the adaptation of these types of reactors to military use, however, will not be exchanged under this Agreement. Likewise, the parties to the Agreement will not exchange under this Agreement Restricted Data pertaining primarily to any future reactor-types the development of which may be concerned primarily with their military use, until such time as these types of reactors warrant civil application and as exchange of information on thees types of reactors may be mutually agreed; and Restricted Data pertaining to the adaptation of these types of reactors to military use will not be exchanged under this Agreement. Nevertheless, information pertaining to military nuclear power plants in furtherance of the joint Canada-United States defense effort in the development of an early-warning radar network may be exchanged.

(3) It is agreed that neither of the parties to this Agreement will exchange Restricted Data on any specific production, experimental power, demonstration power, and power reactor, unless that type of reactor is being operated currently by the other party, or is being considered seriously for construction by the other party as a source of power or as an intermediate step in a power production program. There will, however, be exchanged such general information on design and characteristics of various types of reactors as is required to permit evaluation and comparison of their potential use in a power production program.

C. Source materials

Geology, exploration techniques, chemistry and technology of extracting uranium and thorium from their ores and concentrates, the chemistry, production technology, and techniques of purification and fabrication of uranium and thorium compounds and metals, including design, construction and operation of plants, except as provided in Paragraph A.

D. Materials

(1) Physical, chemical and nuclear properties of all elements, compounds, alloys, mixtures, special nuclear materials, by-product material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes and their behavior under various conditions, except as provided in Paragraph A.

(2) Technology of production and utilization, from laboratory experimentation and theory of production up to pilot plant operations (but not including design and operation of pilot plants and full scale plants, except as may be agreed), of all elements, compounds, alloys, mixtures, special nuclear material, by-product material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes, relevant to and subject to the limitations of Paragraphs B,

E, and F of this Article, except as provided in Paragraph A and (a), (b), (c) and (d) of this subparagraph.

(a) The Commission will not communicate Restricted Data pertaining to design, construction and operation of production plants for the separation of U–235 from other uranium isotopes. The Commission, however, will supply the Government of Canada with uranium enriched in U–235 as provided in Articles III A and Article VI.

(b) The Commission will not communicate Restricted Data on the design, construction and operation of specific production plants for the separation of deuterium from the other isotopes of hydrogen until such time as the Government of Canada shall determine that the construction of such plants is required. The Commission will, however, supply the Government of Canada with heavy water as provided in Article III A and Article VI.

(c) No Restricted Data will be exchanged pertaining to the design, construction and operation of production plants for the separation of isotopes of any other element, except as may be agreed.

(d) No Restricted Data will be exchanged pertaining to the underlying principles, theory, design, construction and operation of facilities, other than reactors, capable of producing significant quantities of isotopes by means of nuclear reactions, except as may be agreed.

E. Health and safety

The entire field of health and safety as related to this Article. In addition, those problems of health and safety which affect the individual, his environment, and the civilian population as a whole and which arise from nuclear explosion (excluding such tests data as would permit the determination of the yield of any specific weapon or nuclear device and excluding any information relating to the design or fabrication of any weapon or nuclear device), and except as provided in Paragraph A.

F. Instruments, instrumentation and devices

Development, design, manufacture, and use of equipment and devices of use in connection with the subjects of agreed exchange of information provided in this Article, except as provided in Paragraph A.

ARTICLE III—RESEARCH MATERIALS AND RESEARCH FACILITIES

A. Research materials

Materials of interest in connection with the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article II, and under the limitations set forth therein, including source materials, special nuclear material, byproducts material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes, will be exchanged for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, except as provided in Article VII, when such materials are not available commercially. These materials for non-research purposes may be supplied by one party of this Agreement to the other as provided in Article VI.

B. Research facilities

Under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, and to the extent as may be agreed, specialized research facilities and reactor testing facilities will be made available for mutual use consistent with the limits of space, facilities and personnel conveniently available, except that it is understood that the Commission will not be able to permit access by Canadian personnel to facilities which, in the opinion of the Commission, are primarily of military significance.

ARTICLE IV—TRANSFER OF EQUIPMENT AND DEVICES

With respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article II, and under the limitations set forth therein, equipment and devices may be transferred from one party to the other to the extent and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, except as provided in Article VII. It is recognized that such transfers will be subject to limitations which may arise from shortages of supplies or other circumstances existing at the time.

ARTICLE V—OTHER ARRANGEMENTS FOR MATERIALS, INCLUDING EQUIPMENT AND DEVICES AND SERVICES

It is contemplated that, as provided in this Article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or Canada may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other country. Accordingly, with respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article II, and under the limitations set forth therein, persons under the jurisdiction of either the Government of the United States of America or the Government of Canada will be permitted to make arrangements to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, to and perform services for the other government and such persons under the jurisdiction of the other government as are authorized by the other government to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, subject to:

(a) The limitation in Article VII:

(b) Applicable laws, regulations and license requirements of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada.

(c) The approval of the government to which the person is subject when the materials or services are classified or when the furnishing of such materials and services requires the communication of classified information.

ARTICLE VI—NONRESEARCH QUANTITIES OF MATERIALS

A. The Commission will sell to Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, a wholly-owned corporation of the Government of Canada, under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, such quantities of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 as may be required in the power reactor program in Canada during this period, subject to any limitations in connection with the quantities of such material available for such distribution by the Commission during any year, and subject to the limitation that the quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 of weapon quality in the possession of the Atomic Energy of Canada Limited by reason of transfer under this agreement shall not, in the opinion of the Commission, be of military significance. It is agreed that the uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 which the Commission will sell to Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, under this article will be limited to uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235. It is understood and agreed that, although Atomic Energy of Canada Limited intends to distribute uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 to authorized users in Canada, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited will retain title to any uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 which is purchased from the Commission until such time as private users in the United States are permitted to acquire title to uranium enriched in the isotope U–235.

The Government of Canada, or its appropriate agent, will give to the Commission a first refusal of any special nuclear materials which the Government of Canada may desire to transfer outside of Canada, where such special nuclear materials have been produced from the irradiation of fuel elements enriched with U–235 purchased from the Commission under the terms of this agreement.

In addition, any special nuclear material transferred by Atomic Energy of Canada Limited to the United States may be retransferred to Canada on such terms and conditions as may be agreed.

B. The Commission will continue the present understanding with Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, a wholly-owned corporation of the Government of Canada, covering the sale of uranium of normal isotopic composition for use in the NRX and NRU reactors.

The Commission will also sell to Atomic Energy of Canada Limited such quantities of uranium of normal isotopic composition, and to the extent practical in such form, as may be required for the power reactor program in Canada and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, subject to the availability of supply and the needs of the United States program.

C. The Commission will continue the present understanding with Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, a wholly-owned corporation of the Government of Canada, covering the sale of heavy water for use in the NRX and NRU reactors. The Commission will also sell to Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, such quantities of heavy water as may be required in the power reactor program in Canada, subject to the availability of supply and the needs of the United States program.

D. It is understood and agreed that the existing contract between the Commission and Atomic Energy of Canada Limited relating to the sale of plutonium, and extensions thereof, will continue in full force and effect.

E. Collaboration between the two countries in the field of raw material has resulted in the development of substantial uranium production in Canada which has been made available to the United States under arrangements and contracts now in effect. These arrangements and contracts shall remain in full force and effect except as modified or revised by mutual agreement.

F. As may be necessary and as mutually agreed in connection with the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article II, and under the limitations set forth therein, specific arrangements may be made from time to time between the parties for lease or sale and purchase of non-research quantities of other materials under such terms and conditions as may be mutually agreed, except as provided in Article VII.

ARTICLE VII—MATERIALS AND FACILITIES PRIMARILY OF MILITARY SIGNIFICANCE

The Commission will not transfer any materials under Article III A or Article VI F and will not transfer or permit the export of any materials or equipment and devices under Article IV and Article V if such materials or equipment and devices are in the opinion of the Commission primarily of military significance.

ARTICLE VIII—CLASSIFICATION POLICIES

The Governments of the United States of America and Canada agree that mutually agreed classification policies shall be maintained with respect to all information and materials, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this Agreement. In addition, the parties intend to continue the present practice of periodic consultation with each other on the classification of atomic-energy information.

ARTICLE IX—PATENTS

A. With respect to any invention or discovery employing information which has been communicated hereunder and made or conceived thereafter during the period of this Agreement, and in which invention or discovery rights are owned by the Government of the United States or by the Government

of Canada or an agency or corporation owned or controlled by either, each party:

(1) Agrees to transfer and assign to the other all right, title, and interest in and to any such invention, discovery, patent application or patent in the country of the other, to the extent owned, subject to a royalty-free, non-exclusive, irrevocable license for its own governmental purposes and for purposes of mutual defense.

(2) Shall retain all right, title, and interest in and to any such invention, discovery, patent application or patent in its own or third countries but will, upon request of the other party, grant to the other party a royalty-free, non-exclusive, irrevocable license for its own governmental purposes in such countries including use in the production of materials in such countries for sale to the other party by a contractor of such other party. Each party may deal with any such invention, discovery, patent application or patent in its own country and all countries other than that of the other party as it may desire, but in no event shall either party discriminate against citizens of the other country in respect of granting any license under the patents owned by it in its own or any other country.

(3) Waives any and all claims against the other party for compensation, royalty or award as respects any such invention or discovery, patent application or patent and releases the other party with respect to any such claim.

B. (1) No patent application with respect to any classified invention or discovery made or conceived during the period of this Agreement in connection with subject matter communicated hereunder may be filed by either party except in accordance with mutually agreed upon conditions and procedure.

(2) No patent application with respect to any such classified invention or discovery may be filed in any country not a party to this Agreement except as may be mutually agreed and subject to Article X.

(3) Appropriate secrecy or prohibition orders will be issued for the purpose of effectuating this provision.

ARTICLE X—SECURITY

A. The Governments of the United States of America and Canada have adopted similar security safeguards and standards in connection with their respective atomic energy programs. The two governments agree that all classified information and material, including equipment and devices, within the scope of this Agreement, will be safeguarded in accordance with the security safeguards and standards prescribed by the security arrangements between the Commission and the Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada in effect on June 15, 1955.

B. It is agreed that the recipient party of any material, including equipment and devices, and of any classified information under this Agreement, shall not further disseminate such information, or transfer such material, including equipment and devices, to any other country without the written consent of the originating country. It is further agreed that neither party to this Agreement will transfer to any other country any equipment or device, the transfer of which would involve the disclosure of any classified information received from the other party, without the written consent of such other party.

ARTICLE XI—GUARANTIES PRESCRIBED BY THE UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

The Government of Canada guarantees that:

A. The security safeguards and standards prescribed by the security arrangements between the Commission and the Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada in effect on June 15, 1955 will be maintained with respect to all classified information and materials, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this Agreement.

B. No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of Canada or authorized persons under its jurisdiction by purchase or otherwise pursuant to this Agreement will be used for atomic weapons, or for research on or development of atomic weapons, or for any other military purpose.

C. No material, including equipment and devices, or any Restricted Data transferred to the Government of Canada or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this Agreement will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of Canada, except as the Commission may agree to such a transfer to another nation, and then only if the transfer of the material or Restricted Data is within the scope of an Agreement for Cooperation between the United States and the other nation.

ARTICLE XII—GUARANTIES BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Government of the United States of America guarantees that:

A. The security safeguards and standards prescribed by the security arrangements between the Commission and the Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada in effect on June 15, 1955 will be maintained with respect to all classified information and materials, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this Agreement.

B. No material, including equipment and devices, or any Restricted Data transferred to the Government of the United States or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this Agreement, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of the United States of America, except as the Government of Canada may agree to such a transfer to another nation.

ARTICLE XIII—STATEMENT CONCERNING CONSTRUCTION OF ARTICLE II A AND B (2) AND ARTICLE XI B

Article II A and B (2) and Article XI B shall not be construed to prevent the Government of Canada from selling materials produced in its reactors to the Government of the United States for defense use or from making available, to the extent the Government of Canada may agree to do so, its reactor testing facilities for use by the Government of the United States in connection with the defense aspects of atomic energy.

ARTICLE XIV—DEFINITIONS

For purposes of this Agreement:

A. "Classified" means a security designation of "Confidential" or higher applied under the laws and regulations of either Canada or the United States to any data, information, materials, services or any other matter, and includes "Restricted Data."

B. "Equipment and devices" means any instrument, apparatus or facility, and includes production facilities and utilization facilities and component parts thereof.

C. "Person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, group, government agency or government corporation, but does not include the parties of this Agreement.

D. "Pilot Plant" means a device operated to acquire specific data for the design of a full-scale plant and which utilizes the process, or a portion thereof, and the type of equipment which would be used in a full-scale production plant.

E. "Reactor" means an apparatus, other than an atomic weapon, in which a self-supporting fission chain reaction is maintained by utilizing uranium, plutonium or thorium, or any combination of uranium, plutonium, or thorium.

F. The terms "production facilities," "utilization facilities," "source materials," "special nuclear materials," "by-product material," "Restricted Data," and "atomic weapon" are used in this Agreement as defined in the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

In witness whereof, the parties hereto have caused this Agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at Washington in duplicate this 15th day of June, 1955.

For the Government of the United States of America:

ROBERT MURPHY.
LEWIS L. STRAUSS.

For the Government of Canada:

A. D. P. HEENEY.
W. J. BENNETT.

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 14, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the attached "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada," and authorize its execution by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

As you know, Canada and the United States were active partners in the wartime undertaking that resulted in the first release of atomic energy by man, and during World War II the collaboration between the two countries was close and invaluable. Since then, however, and until the passage of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, United States participation in a cooperative effort to advance the peaceful uses of atomic energy was severely limited by law. Canada, on the other hand, in continuing to pursue an active atomic energy program for peaceful purposes has closely cooperated with the United States in certain important areas and in a way which has made a valuable contribution to our common defense and security.

Beyond the field of atomic energy, there exists, as the proposed agreement recites, a unique tradition of friendship and cooperation between Canada and the United States. Based on similar national interests and ideals, this tradition has produced special industrial, economic, and cultural relationships which have contributed to our common security and well-being. As you stated in your address to the House of Commons at Ottawa in November 1953, the sense of partnership that for generations has been the hallmark of the relations between Canada and the United States has made each country "a better and stronger and more influential nation because each can rely upon every resource of the other in days of crisis. Beyond this, each can work and grow and prosper with the other through years of quiet peace." The proposed document represents an important step toward achieving in the field of the peaceful uses of atomic energy that sense of partnership which prevails in the other areas of our relationship with Canada, and will materially assist both the United States and Canada in the achievement of the objectives of their respective atomic energy programs.

The agreement calls for an exchange of classified and unclassified information relating to the application of atomic energy to peaceful uses, for an exchange of research materials not available commercially, for the use of research and testing facilities, and for the transfer of equipment and devices. However, of the information which is classified, only that relevant to current or projected programs will be exchanged; and the

parties to the agreement will not exchange restricted data under the agreement which, in the opinion of either country, is primarily of military significance or which relates to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons. Further, it is provided that the Commission will not transfer materials or equipment and devices which in its opinion are primarily of military significance, nor will it grant access to research and testing facilities which are primarily of military significance.

It is provided in the proposed agreement that the Commission will sell to Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (a wholly owned corporation of the Government of Canada) such quantities of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 as may be required in the power reactor program in Canada during the period of the agreement, subject to the availability of this material for such distribution and to the limitation that the quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 of weapon quality in the possession of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited by reason of transfer under the agreement shall not be of military significance, as determined by the Commission. Enriched uranium to be sold under the agreement will be limited to uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235. The Government of Canada, on its part, will give to the Commission a first refusal of any special nuclear materials which it may desire to transfer outside of Canada, where such materials have been produced from the irradiation of fuel elements enriched with U–235 purchased from the Commission. The agreement also provides for continued collaboration between the two countries in the field of raw materials which already has resulted in the development of substantial uranium production in Canada which has been made available to the United States. Under the agreement, it will also be possible for the Commission to continue its use of Canadian reactors for special and unique irradiations of value in the Commission's weapons program. A still further benefit to the United States under the agreement will result from the strengthening of our domestic economy through the authorization granted United States industry to enter into commercial arrangements in the atomic-energy field with the Government of Canada and its authorized nationals.

It is the opinion of the Commission that the proposed agreement is an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy both in the United States and in Canada, in accordance with the policy which you have established. It is the further opinion of the Commission that the cooperative effort which the proposed agreement will permit will further solidify the friendship we now enjoy and go far in assuring the continuance of peace and freedom in our countries.

Respectfully yours,

LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 15, 1955.

The Honorable LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of June 15, 1955, the Atomic Energy Commission recommended that I approve a proposed agreement for cooperation concerning the civil uses of atomic energy between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States of America.

The Commission's letter of recommendation refers to the history of collaboration in the field of atomic energy between Canada and the United States, and points out that, while United States participation in a cooperative effort to advance the peaceful uses of atomic energy was, until the passage of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, severely limited by law, Canada has continued to cooperate closely with the United States in certain important areas and in a way which has contributed to our common defense and security. The Commission's letter also points out, and the proposed agreement so recites, that there exists in other areas a unique tradition of friendship and cooperation between Canada and the United States which has contributed to the security and well-being of both countries.

I have examined the agreement recommended. I share wholeheartedly in the belief of the Commission that the proposed document represents an important step to achieving in the field of the peaceful uses of atomic energy that sense of partnership which prevails in the other areas of our relationships with Canada, and will materially assist both the United States and Canada in the achievement of the objectives of their respective atomic energy programs, thus solidifying further the friendship we now enjoy and contributing to the preservation of peace and freedom in other countries.

The proposed agreement calls for an exchange of classified and unclassified information relating to the application of atomic energy to peaceful uses, for an exchange of research materials not available commercially, for the use of research and testing facilities and for the transfer of equipment and devices. It is also provided that the Commission will sell special nuclear material to Atomic Energy Limited of Canada in such quantities as may be required in the Canadian power reactor program during the term of the agreement.

However, the parties to the agreement will not exchange restricted data under the agreement which, in the opinion of either country, is primarily of military significance or which relates to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons. Nor will the Commission transfer materials or equipment and devices which in its opinion are primarily of military significance, or grant access to research and testing facilities which are primarily of military significance. With respect to the sale of special nuclear material, it is noted that such sale is subject to the limitation that the quantity of this material which would be transferred to Canada shall not be of military significance, as determined by the Commission.

By reason of the state of the art in Canada, the United States will gain materially from the mutual exchange of information and the mutual use of facilities. Further benefits to this country under the agreement will be realized from the first refusal given by Canada to the United States with respect to special nuclear material produced in Canada from the irradiation of fuel elements enriched with U–235 purchased from the Commission, from continued collaboration in the important field of raw materials, from the continued use of Canadian reactors for special irradiations of value in the Commission's weapons program, and from the general strengthening of our domestic economy which will result from the development of commercial activities between the two countries and their nationals in the field of atomic energy.

Accordingly, pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby—

(1) Approve the within proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada concerning the civil uses of atomic energy.

(2) Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States, and

(3) Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for cooperation for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT EISENHOWER.

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1955.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy,
Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123 (c) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 there is submitted with this letter:

(1) A proposed agreement for cooperation with the Government of Canada;

(2) A letter dated June 14, 1955, from the Commission to the President recommending his approval of the proposed agreement;

(3) A letter dated June 15, 1955, from the President to the Commission approving the proposed agreement, authorizing its execution, and containing his determination that the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

This proposed agreement for cooperation calls for the exchange of classified and unclassified information and material, including restricted data, and is more extensive in scope than the unclassified research agreements which previously have been submitted to this session of the Congress.

The arrangement contained in the proposed agreement results from the special relationship which exists between Canada and the United States in the atomic energy field.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION CONCERNING THE CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF BELGIUM

Beginning with discussions in 1940 the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Belgium have cooperated with each other in the atomic energy field.

As a result of these discussions, the Belgian Government and the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom reached a common understanding as to the desirability during World War II, as well as in the future, that all uranium ores wherever located should be subject to effective control for the protection of civilization. To this end, the Government of Belgium undertook to insure effective control of such ores located in all territory subject to its authority.

The Belgian Government has also made available Congo uranium ores to the United States and the United Kingdom through commercial contracts. The Belgian Government further undertook to use its best endeavors to supply such quantities of uranium ores as might be required by the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom.

The arrangements outlined above were on the understanding that Belgium would reserve for itself such quantities of uranium ores as might be required for its own scientific and industrial purposes. The Belgian Government, however, in deciding to utilize such ores as a source of energy for commercial power would do so in consultation and in agreement with the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom. The latter on their part agreed that the Belgian Government should participate on equitable terms in the utilization of these ores as a source of energy for commercial power at such time as the two Governments should decide to employ the ores for this purpose.

Since that time the Government of Belgium has made available to the United States and to the United Kingdom, through commercial contracts, a vitally important quantity of uranium produced in the Belgian Congo and thus has made a unique contribution to the defense of the Western World. The United States and the United Kingdom have assisted in the development of the Congo uranium properties and have assisted the Government of Belgium in the establishment of a research and development program the principal objective of which is the realization of the peaceful use of atomic energy. Consequently a special relationship exists between the Government of the United States and the Government of Belgium in the field of atomic energy. While the United States must continue to give priority to the defense aspects of atomic energy, an increasing number of opportunities exist for the development of its peaceful applications. In keeping, therefore, with the special relationship, the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Belgium, the Parties to this Agreement, desire to establish an expanded program of cooperation and have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

It is the intent of this Agreement that the Government of Belgium will receive from the United States Atomic Energy Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), in the field of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, information and materials on terms as favorable as any other major uranium supplying country except Canada.

ARTICLE II—PERIOD OF AGREEMENT

This Agreement shall enter into force on the date of receipt by the Government of Belgium of a notification from the Government of the United States of America that the period of thirty days required by Section 123c of the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954 has elapsed, and it shall remain in force through July 31, 1965. The Parties will reexamine the bases of this Agreement if world disarmament is realized or if a threat to world peace so requires.

ARTICLE III—EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION

A. With the objective of facilitating the development of peacetime uses of atomic energy, and particularly the development of atomic power, the Government of Belgium and the Commission agree to exchange the following information, subject to the limitations of paragraph C of this Article:

(1) General information on the overall progress and economics of power reactor programs;

(2) Technological information required for the construction of specific reactors for the Belgian power program in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, and Ruanda-Urundi.

B. The exchange of information provided for in this Article includes the communication to the Commission of information developed in the Belgian power program and will be accomplished through the various means available, such as reports, conferences, and visits to facilities, and shall, subject to the limitations of paragraph C, include the following:

1. The Commission will transmit as needed in the Belgian project information relating to reactors which Belgium intends to construct as a part of its current experimental power and power program and which falls within one or the other of the following areas:

(a) Specifications for Reactor Materials: Final form specifications including composition, shape, size, and special handling techniques of reactor materials including uranium, heavy water, pile grade graphite, zirconium.

(b) Properties of Reactor Materials: Physical, chemical, metallurgical, nuclear, and mechanical properties of reactor materials including fuel, moderator and coolant and the effects of the reactor's operating conditions on the properties of these materials.

(c) Reactor Components: The design and performance specifications of reactor components but not including the methods of production and fabrication.

(d) Reactor Physics Technology: This area includes theory of and pertinent data relating to neutron bombardment reactions, neutron cross sections, critical calculations, reactor kinetics, and shielding.

(e) Reactor Engineering Technology: This area includes considerations pertinent to the overall design and optimization of the reactor and theory and data relating to such problems as reactor stress and heat transfer analysis.

(f) Environmental Safety Considerations: This area includes considerations relating to normal reactor radiations and possible accidental hazards and the effect of these on equipment and personnel and appropriate methods of waste disposal and decontamination.

2. The Commission will receive selected security-cleared personnel from Belgium to work with and participate in the construction of the PWR reactor at Shippingport, Pennsylvania, and such other reactors as may be agreed.

3. The Commission will transmit to the Belgian Government all essential information as indicated in subparagraph B1 relating to the objective of making it possible for Belgium to design, construct, and operate a thermal, heterogeneous, pressurized light or heavy water (boiling or non-boiling) reactor if the decision is made on the part of the Belgian Government to construct such a reactor.

4. There will be collaboration with respect to unclassified reactor information and technology and with respect to unclassified information relating to the production of reactor materials such as heavy water, zirconium, and hafnium.

C. 1. The Parties will not exchange Restricted Data under this Agreement relating to design or fabrication of atomic weapons or information which, in the opinion of the Commission, is primarily of military significance; and no Restricted Data concerning the production of special nuclear materials will be exchanged except that concerning the incidental production of special nuclear materials in a power reactor. It is recognized that the Commission may come into possession of privately developed and privately owned information and information received from other governments which it is not permitted to exchange. It is also recognized that the Government of Belgium may come into possession of information developed and owned by private persons and industries not having access to information transmitted under this Agreement and information received from other governments which it is not permitted to exchange.

2. a. The Commission will communicate classified technical information required for the construction of any specific reactor only when Belgium is seriously considering the construction of the specific type of reactor in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, or Ruanda-Urundi and when private industry in the United States is permitted to undertake the construction and operation of the same type of reactor. In addition, the Commission will communicate classified information on any specific type of reactor other than those types mentioned in subparagraph B 3 only when, except as may otherwise be agreed, the Commission has made a finding that the specific type of reactor has been sufficiently developed to be of practical value for industrial or commercial purposes.

b. Further, the Commission will communicate classified information pertaining exclusively to any reactor-types, such as submarine, ship, aircraft, and certain package power reactors, the development of which is concerned primarily with their military use, only when, in the opinion of the Commission, these types of reactors warrant peacetime application and as exchange of information on these types of reactors may be mutually agreed.

ARTICLE IV—RESEARCH MATERIALS

Materials of interest in connection with the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article III, and under the limitations set forth therein, including source materials, special nuclear materials, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes will be exchanged for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, except as provided in Article VIII, when such materials are not available commercially. These materials for non-research purposes may be supplied by one Party to this Agreement to the other as provided in Article VII.

ARTICLE V—TRANSFER OF EQUIPMENT AND DEVICES

With respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article III, and under the limitations set forth therein, equipment and devices may be transferred from one party to the other under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, except as provided in Article VIII. It is recognized that such transfers will be subject to limitations which may arise from shortages of supplies or other circumstances existing at the time.

ARTICLE VI—OTHER ARRANGEMENTS FOR MATERIALS, INCLUDING EQUIPMENT AND DEVICES, AND SERVICES

It is contemplated that, as provided in this Article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or Belgium may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other country. Accordingly, with respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article III, and under the limitations set forth therein, persons under the jurisdiction of either the Government of the United States or the Government of Belgium will be permitted to make arrangements to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, to and perform services for the other Government and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by the other Government to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, subject to:

(a) The limitation in Article VIII;

(b) Applicable laws, regulations and license requirements of the Government of the United States and of the Government of Belgium;

(c) The approval of the Government to which the person is subject when the materials or services are classified or when the furnishing of such materials and services requires the communication of classified information.

ARTICLE VII—NON-RESEARCH QUANTITIES OF MATERIALS

A. 1. The Commission will sell to the Government of Belgium under such terms and conditions as may be agreed such quantities of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 as Belgium may require during the period of this Agreement for use in research and power reactors located in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, and Ruanda-Urundi, subject to any limitations in connection with quantities of such material available for such distribution by the Commission during any year, and subject to the limitation that the quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 of weapon quality in the possession of Belgium by reason of transfer under this Agreement shall not, in the opinion of the Commission, be of military significance. It is agreed that the uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 which the Commission will sell to Belgium under this Article will be limited

to uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235. It is understood and agreed that although Belgium will distribute uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 to authorized users in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, and Ruanda-Urundi, the Government of Belgium will retain title to any uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 which is purchased from the Commission until such time as private users in the United States are permitted to acquire title to uranium enriched in the isotope U–235.

2. It is agreed that when any fuel elements received from the United States or any fuel elements fabricated from uranium of normal isotopic composition or uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 received from the United States require reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed by the Commission on terms and conditions to be later agreed; and it is understood, except as may be agreed, the form and content of the irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission for reprocessing.

B. The Commission will sell to Belgium under such terms and conditions as may be agreed such quantities of uranium of normal isotopic composition as Belgium may require, and to the extent practical in such form as Belgium may request, during the period of this Agreement for use in research and power reactors located in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, and Ruanda-Urundi, subject to the availability of supply and the needs of the United States program.

C. The Commission shall have an option to purchase any special nuclear materials produced in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, or Ruanda-Urundi, from materials sold in accordance with A and B of this Article and which are in excess of Belgium's need for such materials in its program for the peacetime use of atomic energy. Belgium agrees not to transfer to any country other than the United States or the United Kingdom any special nuclear materials produced in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, or Ruanda-Urundi unless the Government of Belgium is given assurance that the material will not be used for military purposes, and the Government of Belgium agrees to consult with the United States on the international significance of any proposed transfer of any uranium and thorium ores or special nuclear materials to any country other than the United Kingdom.

D. The Commission will sell to Belgium, under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, such quantities of heavy water as Belgium may require, during the period of this Agreement, for use in research and power reactors located in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, and Ruanda-Urundi, subject to the availability of supply and the needs of the United States program.

E. 1. It is agreed that existing commercial contracts between the Combined Development Agency and the African Metals Corporation, acting for the producing company (Union Miniere du Haut Katanga), for the sale of uranium ores and concentrates to said Agency shall continue in effect until their expiration as provided in these contracts.

2. The Government of Belgium will use its best endeavors to see that the Combined Development Agency will have a first option to purchase:

(a) 90 percent of the uranium and thorium ores and concentrates produced in Belgium and the Belgian Congo during calendar years 1956 and 1957.

(b) 75 percent of the uranium and thorium ores and concentrates produced in Belgium and the Belgian Congo during calendar years 1958, 1959, and 1960.

3. In addition to the percentage stated in the foregoing schedule with respect to any calendar year, this option shall also extend to such additional quantities of uranium ores and concentrates to provide for the production of the materials sold to Belgium by the Commission in accordance with paragraphs A and B of this Article during any such year. The formulae for the purpose of making computations required to give effect to this provision are:

(a) 102 kilograms of contained elemental uranium in the form of ore or ore concentrates will provide for 100 kilograms of elemental uranium of natural isotopic composition in the form of purified metal or compounds.

(b) The preparation of uranium enriched in U–235 content will be assumed to be accomplished by the isotopic separation of uranium of natural isotopic composition into enriched material having the required U–235 content and depleted material having a U–235 content of 0.4 percent.

4. If the Belgian Government does not require for its own use all or part of the uranium and thorium ores produced in Belgium and the Belgian Congo during the foregoing period and which are not covered by the options in subparagraphs E 2 and E 3, it will consult with the Commission concerning the sale of such uranium and thorium ores to the Combined Development Agency.

5. Belgium will in due course evaluate its requirements of uranium and thorium ores and concentrates for the period of this Agreement remaining after calendar year 1960, and the Parties hereto will consult with each other for the purpose of establishing an agreed percentage of such materials which the Combined Development Agency shall have the first option to purchase.

6. It is agreed that the Government of Belgium shall be kept informed of the division, between the United States and the United Kingdom, of uranium and thorium ores and concentrates sold to the Combined Development Agency in accordance with this Agreement. Belgium agrees that if so requested by the Commission and the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority, the options to the Combined Development Agency in subparagraphs 2, 3, 4, and 5 of this paragraph may be exercised as follows:

(a) Through a contract or contracts with either the Commission or the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority; or

(b) Through a contract or contracts with the Commission and a contract or contracts with the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority.

7. (a) If before the termination of this Agreement (1) the diminution of available ore supply results in a decline in the rate of production of uranium ores and concentrates in Belgium and the Belgian Congo by as much as 80 (eighty) percent of the rate of production in 1955 and (2) if the strategic stockpiles of special nuclear material in the United States and the United Kingdom have been demilitarized or if the civilian needs in the United States and the United Kingdom are covered without limitation by means of production and current imports of uranium ores and uranium concentrates, the Government of Belgium shall have the right to purchase from the Commission on such terms as are agreed a total quantity of material, in the form and manner described in (b) of this subparagraph, as is equivalent to the total quantity of uranium ores and concentrates sold under and during the period of this Agreement (1) to the Combined Development Agency, and acquired by the Commission, and (2) directly to the Commission if uranium ores and concentrates are sold to the Commission in accordance with paragraph 6 of this Article.

(b) (1) At the election of the Combined Development Agency or the Commission, whichever is appropriate, the material so sold to the Government of Belgium may be in the form of ores and concentrates or uranium of normal isotopic composition in the form of purified metals or compounds or any combination of these.

(2) In determining that quantity of one of these materials which is equivalent to a given quantity of another, the formulae in paragraph E 3 (a) shall be used.

(3) The material shall be delivered within five years after this provision comes into effect in accordance with an agreed schedule of deliveries.

F. As may be necessary and as mutually agreed in connection with the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article III, and under the limitations set forth therein, specific arrangements may be made from time to time between the Parties for lease, or sale and purchase, of quantities of materials, other than special nuclear materials, greater than those required for research, under such terms and conditions as may be mutually agreed, except as provided in Article VIII.

ARTICLE VIII—MATERIALS AND FACILITIES PRIMARILY OF MILITARY SIGNIFICANCE

It is agreed that the Commission will not transfer any materials under Article IV or Article VII F and will not transfer or permit the export of any materials or equipment and devices under Articles V and VI if such materials or equipment and devices are in the opinion of the Commission primarily of military significance.

ARTICLE IX—PATENTS

The United States shall have all rights, title, and interest within its jurisdiction as to any inventions or discoveries made by any person under the jurisdiction of the Belgian Government as a result of such person's access to Restricted Data communicated to Belgium under this Agreement, provided such invention or discovery is made during the period of this Agreement or within three years thereafter.

ARTICLE X—SECURITY

A. The criteria of security classification established by the Commission shall be applicable to all information and material, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this Agreement. The Commission will keep the Government of Belgium informed concerning these criteria and any modifications thereof, and the Parties will consult with each other from time to time concerning the practical application of these criteria.

B. It is agreed that all information and material, including equipment and devices, which warrant a classification in accordance with paragraph A of this Article shall be safeguarded in accordance with the security safeguards and standards prescribed by the security arrangements between the Government of the United States, represented by the Commission, and the Government of Belgium in effect on June 15, 1955.

C. It is agreed that the recipient Party of any material, including equipment and devices, and of any classified information under this Agreement shall not further disseminate such information or transfer such material, including equipment and devices, to any other country without the written consent of the originating country. It is further agreed that neither Party to this Agreement will transfer to any other country any equipment or device, the transfer of which would involve the disclosure of any classified information received from the other Party, without the written consent of such other Party.

ARTICLE XI—GUARANTIES PRESCRIBED BY THE UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

The Government of Belgium guarantees that—

A. The security safeguards and standards prescribed by the security arrangements between the Government of the United States, represented by the Commission, and the Government of Belgium in effect on June 15,

1955, will be maintained with respect to all classified information and materials, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this Agreement.

B. No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to Belgium by purchase or otherwise pursuant to this Agreement will be used for atomic weapons, or for research on or development of atomic weapons, or for any other military purpose.

C. No material, including equipment and devices, or any Restricted Data transferred to Belgium pursuant to this Agreement will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of Belgium except as the Commission may agree to such a transfer to another nation, and then only if the transfer of the material or Restricted Data is within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the United States and the other nation.

ARTICLE XII—DEFINITIONS

For purposes of this Agreement:

A. "Atomic weapon" means any device utilizing atomic energy, exclusive of the means for transporting or propelling the device (where such means is a separable and divisible part of the device), the principal purpose of which is for use as, or for development of, a weapon, a weapon prototype, or a weapon test device.

B. "Byproduct material" means any radioactive material (except special nuclear material) yielded in or made radioactive by exposure to the radiation incident to the process of producing or utilizing special nuclear material.

C. "Classified" means a security designation of "Confidential" or higher applied, under the laws and regulations of either the Government of Belgium or the Government of the United States, to any data, information, materials, services or any other matter, and includes "Restricted Data."

D. "Combined Development Agency" means the contracting Agency which acts on behalf of the United States and the United Kingdom with respect to the purchase of uranium and thorium ores and concentrates.

E. "Equipment and devices" and "equipment or device" means any instrument, apparatus, or facility and includes any facility, except an atomic weapon, capable of making use of or producing special nuclear material, and component parts thereof.

F. "Person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, group, government agency or government corporation but does not include the Parties to this Agreement.

G. "Reactor" means an apparatus, other than an atomic weapon, in which a self-supporting fission chain reaction is maintained by utilizing uranium, plutonium, or thorium, or any combination of uranium, plutonium, or thorium.

H. "Restricted Data" means all data concerning (1) design, manufacture, or utilization of atomic weapons; (2) the production of special nuclear material; or (3) the use of special nuclear material in the production of energy, but shall not include data declassified or removed from the category of Restricted Data by the appropriate authority.

I. "Special nuclear material" means (1) plutonium, uranium enriched in the isotope 233 or in the isotope 235, and any other material which the Government of Belgium or the Commission determines to be special nuclear material; or (2) any material artificially enriched by any of the foregoing.

ARTICLE XIII—EXISTING ARRANGEMENTS

This Agreement shall supersede all existing arrangements between the Parties concerning atomic energy matters (1) except insofar as these arrangements are reflected in commercial contracts, the continuation of which is provided for in Article VII E I, (2) except any contracts between the Commission and the Government of Belgium which by their terms provide otherwise, and (3) except any arrangements with regional defense organizations of which the Government of Belgium is a member.

In witness whereof, the parties hereto have caused this Agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority

Done at Washington in duplicate this 15th day of June 1955, in the English and French languages, but in any case in which divergence between the two versions results in different interpretations the English version shall be given preference.

For the Government of the United States of America:

ROBERT MURPHY.
LEWIS L. STRAUSS.

For the Government of Belgium:

SILVERCRUYS.

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the attached Agreement for Cooperation Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of Belgium and the Government of the United States of America, and authorize its execution by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

There exists a special relationship between the Government of Belgium and the Government of the United States in the field of atomic energy, and beginning with discussions initiated in 1940 the two Governments have closely cooperated with each other in this field. Under an arrangement made in 1944, the Belgian Government agreed with the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom that all uranium ores wherever located should be subject to effective control for the protection of civilization, and the Government of Belgium undertook to insure the effective control of such ores located in all territories subject to its authority. The Belgian Government also agreed that all uranium ores in the Belgian Congo, including ore from the rich Shinkolobwe Mine, should be made available to the United States and the United Kingdom through commercial contracts, and that it would use its best endeavors to supply such quantities of uranium ores as might be required by the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom. The Governments of the United States and of the United Kingdom, on their part, agreed that the Belgian Government should participate on equitable terms in the utilization of these ores as a source of energy for commercial power at such time as the two Governments should decide to employ the ores for this purpose.

Since the 1944 arrangement, the Government of Belgium, through commercial contracts, has made available to the United States and to the United Kingdom a vitally important quantity of uranium produced in the Belgian Congo. This has constituted a unique contribution to the defense of the western world and to our strength as a nation dedicated to the preservation of peace and freedom.

In addition to being the principal foreign supplier of uranium, Belgium's interest in atomic energy is also evident in its strong scientific and technical community. This interest led in 1950 to the appointment of an Atomic Energy Commissioner to coordinate the country's atomic-energy programs, and current plans call for work in both the research and power fields. The United States now has the opportunity to assist Belgium in these programs, and thus materially express our gratitude for the great contribution the Belgians have made to our common defense and security.

The proposed agreement calls for an exchange of classified and unclassified information relating to the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy and, particularly, the development of atomic power, including general information in the overall progress and economics of power-reactor programs and technological information required for the construction of specific reactors for the Belgian program in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, and Ruanda-Urundi, and other specified reactor information. The agreement also provides for an exchange of research materials not available commercially, and for the transfer of equipment and devices. However, the parties will not exchange restricted data under the agreement relating to design or fabrication of atomic weapons or information which, in the opinion of the Commission, is primarily of military significance; and no restricted data concerning the production of special nuclear materials will be exchanged except that concerning the incidental production of special nuclear materials in a power reactor. Further, the Commission will not transfer any materials or equipment and devices which in the opinion of the Commission are primarily of military significance.

It is provided in the proposed agreement that the Commission will sell to the Government of Belgium such quantities of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 as Belgium may require, during the period of this agreement, for use in research and power reactors located in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, and Ruanda-Urundi, subject to any limitations in connection with quantities of such material available for such distribution by the Commission during any year, and subject to the further limitation that the quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 of weapon quality in the possession of Belgium by reason of transfer under the agreement shall not, in the opinion of the Commission, be of military significance. Enriched uranium to be sold under the agreement will be limited to uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235. The Government of Belgium, on its part, will give to the Commission an option to purchase any special nuclear materials produced in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, or Ruandi-Urundi, from materials purchased from the Commission and which are in excess of Belgium's need in its program for the peacetime uses of atomic energy. The agreement also provides for the continuance of existing commercial contracts relating to the sale of uranium ores and concentrates; and the Government of Belgium undertakes to use its best endeavors to see that the Combined Development Agency (a contracting agency which acts on behalf of the United States and the United Kingdom with respect to the purchase of uranium and thorium ores and concentrates) will have a first option to purchase 90 percent of the uranium and thorium and concentrates produced in Belgium and the Belgian Congo during calendar years 1956 and 1957, and 75 percent of such ores and concentrates produced during the calendar years 1958, 1959, and 1960. Belgium also agrees to evaluate its requirements of uranium- and thorium-ore concentrates the period of the agreement remaining after calendar year 1960 and to consult with the United States for the purpose of establishing an agreed percentage of materials which thereafter the Combined Development Agency shall have the first option to purchase. Equitable consideration has led to incorporating in the agreement a formula whereby the Government of Belgium may repurchase material in the event the diminution of available ore supply results in a decline in the rate of production of uranium ores and concentrates in Belgium

and the Belgian Congo by as much as 80 percent of the rate of production in 1955 and if the strategic stockpiles of special nuclear material in the United States and the United Kingdom have been demilitarized.

The proposed agreement is in keeping with the previous undertaking of the United States that the Belgian Government should participate on equitable terms in the utilization of uranium ores as a source of energy for commercial power when the decision was made to employ the ores for this purpose. It represents, in the opinion of the Commission, an important step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Belgium, in accordance with the policy which you have established concerning such development in the free nations of the world. The consideration and benefit which will flow to the United States is very real, and the proposed agreement will further solidify the friendship we now enjoy with Belgium. Its performance will materially assist in assuring the continuance of peace and freedom in our countries and throughout the Western World.

Respectfully,

LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 15, 1955.

The Honorable L. L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of June 15, 1955, the Atomic Energy Commission recommended that I approve a proposed agreement for cooperation concerning the civil uses of atomic energy between the Government of Belgium and the Government of the United States of America.

The Commission's letter of recommendation refers to the special relationship between Belgium and the United States in the atomic-energy field and to the arrangements which have been in effect since 1944 with respect to uranium ores from the Belgian Congo. The Commission's letter also states that the important quantity of uranium made available by the Government of Belgium has constituted a unique contribution to the defense of the free world and to our strength as a nation dedicated to the preservation of peace and freedom.

I am in complete accord with the Commission's view concerning the importance of the Belgian contribution, and take this opportunity to ask that you personally convey the gratitude of our people to the appropriate representatives of the Belgian Government.

I have examined the agreement recommended. It calls for an exchange of classified and unclassified information relating to the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy and particularly to the development of atomic power, for the exchange of research materials not available commercially, and for the transfer of equipment and devices. It is provided, however, that the parties to the agreement will not exchange restricted data relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons or information which, in the opinion of the Commission, is primarily of military significance. Further, no restricted data concerning the production of special nuclear material will be exchanged, except that concerning the incidental production of such material in a power reactor; nor will the Commission transfer any materials or equipment or devices which, in the opinion of the Commission, are primarily of military significance.

It is also provided in the recommended agreement that the Commission will sell special nuclear material to the Government of Belgium in such quantities as may be required during the term of the agreement for use in research and power reactors located in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, and Ruanda-Urundi, subject to any limitations in connection with quantities of such material available for distribution during any year and the further limitation that the quantity of material of weapons quality in possession of Belgium by reason of transfer under the agreement shall not be of military significance.

The benefits which the United States will receive in the performance of the proposed agreement are substantial. Belgium, on its part, will give the Commission an option to purchase special nuclear materials produced in Belgian reactors from materials purchased from the Commission which are in excess of Belgium's need in its program for the peacetime uses of atomic energy. The agreement also provides for the continuance of commercial contracts relating to the sale of uranium ores and concentrates, and Belgium undertakes to use its best endeavors to see that the Combined Development Agency will have a first option on a large percentage of ores and concentrates produced through calendar year 1960.

In addition to the benefits which the United States will receive, the proposed agreement responds to a previous undertaking by the United States that the Belgian Government should participate on equitable terms in the utilization of uranium ores as a source of energy for commercial power.

Accordingly, pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby—

(1) Approve the within proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of Belgium concerning the civil uses of atomic energy.

(2) Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States, and

(3) Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT EISENHOWER.

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1955.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic
Energy, Congress of the United States

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123 (c) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 there is submitted with this letter:

(1) A proposed Agreement for Cooperation with the Government of Belgium;

(2) A letter dated June 15, 1955 from the Commission to the President recommending his approval of the proposed agreement;

(3) A letter dated June 15, 1955 from the President to the Commission approving the proposed agreement, authorizing its execution, and containing his determination that the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

This proposed agreement for cooperation calls for the exchange of classified and unclassified information and material, including restricted data, and is more extensive in scope than the unclassified research agreements which previously have been submitted to this session of the Congress.

The arrangement contained in the proposed agreement results from the special relationship which exists between Belgium and the United States in the atomic energy field.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION ON THE CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

The Government of the United States of America (including the United States Atomic Energy Commission) and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, on its own behalf and on behalf of the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority;

Considering that they have for several years been engaged in atomic energy programs within their respective countries and from the inception of these programs have collaborated closely in certain fields;

Considering that the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes is a major objective of each of these programs;

Believing that mutual benefit would result from further cooperation between them; and

Recognizing that for the present their main efforts in the field of atomic energy will be directed to defense but desiring also to promote the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes;

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

Scope of agreement

A. Subject to the provisions of this Agreement, the availability of material and personnel, and the applicable laws, regulations and license requirements in force in their respective countries, the Parties shall assist each other in the achievement of the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. It is the intent of the Parties that such assistance shall be rendered on a reciprocal basis.

B. The disposition and utilization of atomic weapons and the exchange of restricted data relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons shall be outside the scope of this Agreement.

C. The exchange of restricted data under this Agreement shall be subject to the following limitations:

(i) It shall extend only to that which is relevant to current or projected programs.

(ii) Restricted data which is primarily of military significance shall not be exchanged.

(iii) The development of submarine, ship, aircraft, and certain package power reactors is presently concerned primarily with their military uses. Accordingly, restricted data pertaining to such reactors will not be exchanged until such time as these types of reactors warrant peacetime application and the exchange of information on these types of reactors may be agreed. Information on the adaptation of these types of reactors to military use will not be exchanged. Likewise, restricted data pertaining primarily to any future reactor-types the development of which is concerned primarily with their military use will not be exchanged until such time as these types of reactors warrant civil application and exchange of information on these types of reactors may be agreed; and restricted data on the adaptation of these types of reactors to military use will not be exchanged.

(iv) Restricted data on specific experimental power, demonstration power, or power reactors will not be exchanged unless the reactor is currently in operation in the receiving country or is being considered seriously for construction by the receiving country as a source of power or as an intermediate step in a power production program. There shall, however, be exchanged such general information, including restricted data, on design and characteristics of various types of reactors as is required to permit evaluation and comparison of their potential use in a power production program.

D. This Agreement shall not require the exchange of any information which the Parties are not permitted to communicate because the information is privately developed and privately owned or has been received from another government.

E. The Parties will not transfer or export, or permit the transfer or export, under this Agreement of any material, equipment or device which is primarily of a military character.

ARTICLE II

Exchange of information between the Commission and the Authority

Subject to the provisions of Article I, classified information in the specific fields set out below and unclassified information shall be exchanged between the Commission and the Authority with respect to the application of atomic energy to peaceful uses, including research and development relating to such uses and problems of health and safety connected therewith. The exchange of information provided for in this Article shall be accomplished through the various means available, including reports, conferences and visits to facilities. The following are the fields in which classified information shall be exchanged:

A. Reactors

1. Fields of exchange:

(a) Reactor physics, including theory of and pertinent data relating to neutron bombardment reactions, neutron cross sections, criticality calculations, reactor kinetics, and shielding.

(b) Reactor engineering—theory of and data relating to such problems as reactor stress and heat transfer analysis insofar as these are pertinent to the over-all design and optimization of the retactor.

(c) Properties of reactor materials—effects of operating conditions on the properties of reactor materials, including fuel, moderator and coolant.

(d) Specification for reactor materials—final form specifications including composition, shape, and size, and special handling techniques of reactor materials including source material, special nuclear material, heavy water, reactor grade graphite, and zirconium.

(e) Reactor components—general performance specifications of reactor components.

(f) Over-all design and characteristics, and operational techniques and performance, of research, experimental power, demonstration power, and power reactors.

2. Detailed designs, detailed drawings and applied technology of reactors of the types referred to in subparagraph 1 (f) of this paragraph and of related components, equipment and devices in this field shall not be exchanged except as may be agreed.

3. The exchange of information under this paragraph shall include and be limited to information from the following sources and shall be accomplished in such a manner as to maintain a reciprocal basis of exchange:

(a) Information developed by and for the Commission and information developed by and for the public and private utility groups in the United States with the assistance of the Commission;

(b) Information developed by and for the Authority and information developed by and for the United Kingdom Electricity Supply Authorities with the assistance of the Authority.

B. Uranium and Thorium

Geology, exploration techniques, chemistry and technology of extracting uranium and thorium from their ores and concentrates, the chemistry, production technology and techniques of purification and fabrication of uranium and thorium compounds and metals, including design, construction, and operation of plants.

C. Properties of Materials

Physical, chemical, and nuclear properties of all elements, compounds, alloys, mixtures, special nuclear material, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes and their behavior under all conditions.

D. Technology of Production and Utilization of Materials

1. Technology of production and utilization, from laboratory experimentation up to pilot plant operations but not including design and operation of pilot plants except as may be agreed, of all elements, compounds, alloys, mixtures, special nuclear material, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes relevant to paragraphs A and E of this Article.

2. This paragraph shall not be construed as including:

(a) the exchange of restricted data pertaining to design, construction, and operation of production plants for the separation of U-235 from other uranium isotopes:

(b) the exchange of restricted data on the design, construction, and operation of specific production plants for the separation of deuterium from the other isotpe of hydrogen until such time as the Party wishing to receive the information shall determine that the construction of such plants is required; the Commission will, however, supply the Authority with heavy water as provided in Article III A and Article IV;

(c) the exchange of restricted data pertaining to design, construction, and operation of production plants for the separation of isotopes of any other element, except as may be agreed;

(d) the exchange of restricted data pertaining to the underlying principles, theory, design, construction, and operation of facilities, other than reactors, capable of producing significant quantities of isotopes by means of nuclear reactions, except as may be agreed.

E. Health and Safety

The entire field of health and safety as related to any of the fields within which information is to be exchanged in accordance with the provisions of this Article; in addition those problems of health and safety which affect the individual, his environment, and the civilian population as a whole and which arise from nuclear explosion (excluding such test data as woud permit the determination of the yield of any specific weapon or nuclear device and excluding any information relating to the design or fabrication of any weapon or nuclear device).

ARTICLE III

Research materials and research facilities

A. Research Materials

Materials of interest in connection with any subject of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article II subject to the provisions of Article I, including source material, special nuclear material, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes shall, except as provided in paragraph E of Article I, be exchanged for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially to the Party wishing to receive them.

B. Research Facilities

Under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, specialized research facilities and reactor testing facilities shall be made available for mutual use consistent with the limits of space, facilities, and personnel conveniently available, except that it is understood that neither Party will be able to permit access by personnel of the other Party to facilities which are primarily of military significance.

ARTICLE IV

Materials for purposes other than research

In connection with any subject of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article II subject to the provisions of Article I, specific arrangements may be agreed between the Parties from time to time for the sale and purchase, under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, of quantities, greater than those required for research, of materials other than special nuclear materials.

ARTICLE V

Transfer of equipment and devices

With respect to any subject of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article II subject to the provisions of Article I, equipment and devices may be transferred from one Party to the other under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, except as provided in paragraph E of Article I. It is recognized that such transfers will be subject to limitations which may arise from shortages of supplies or other circumstances existing at the time.

ARTICLE VI

Permissive arrangements for materials, including equipment and devices, and services

A. Within the fields specified in paragraph B of this Article, persons under the jurisdiction of one Party shall be permitted to make arrangements to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices and rights owned by them therein, to and perform services for the other Party and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by it to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, provided that any classified information the disclosure of which would be involved shall fall within the fields specified in paragraph B and subject to:

(1) the provisions of paragraph E of Article I;

(2) applicable laws, regulations and license requirements;

(3) approval of the Party to the jurisdiction of which the person making the arrangement is subject if the materials or services are classified or if the furnishing of such materials or services requires the communication of classified information.

B. To the extent necessary in carrying out the arrangements made under paragraph A of this Article, classified information in the following fields, subject in each case to the provisions of Article I, may be communicated by the person furnishing the material or services to the Party or person to whom such material or service is furnished:

(1) the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article II;

(2) the development, design, construction, operation, and use of research, experimental power, demonstration power, and power reactors;

(3) the development, design, manufacture, and use of equipment and devices of use in connection with the fields described in this paragraph.

ARTICLE VII

Patents

A. With respect to any invention or discovery employing information which has been communicated under this Agreement by one of the Parties to the other in accordance with Article II and made or conceived thereafter but during the period of this Agreement, and in which invention or discovery rights are owned by the Government of the United States or by the Government of the United Kingdom or any agency or corporation owned or controlled by either, each Party:

(1) agrees to transfer and assign to the other Party all right, title, and interest in and to any such invention, discovery, patent application or patent in the country of that other Party, to the extent owned, subject to a royalty-free, non-exclusive, irrevocable license for the governmental purposes of such other Party and for purposes of mutual defense;

(2) shall retain all right, title, and interest in and to any such invention, discovery, patent application or patent in its own or third countries but shall, upon request of the other Party, grant to that other Party a royalty-free, non-exclusive, irrevocable license for the governmental purposes of such other Party in such countries, including use in the production of materials in such countries for sale to the other Party by a contractor of such other Party; each Party may deal with any such invention, discovery, patent application or patent in its own country and all countries other than that of the other Party as it may desire, but in no event shall either Party discriminate against citizens of the country of the other Party in respect of granting any license under the patents owned by it in its own or any other country;

(3) waives any and all claims against the other Party for compensation, royalty or award as respects any such invention or discovery, patent application or patent and releases the other Party with respect to any such claim.

B. (1) No patent application with respect to any classified invention or discovery employing information which has been communicated under this Agreement may be filed by either Party or any person in the country of the other Party except in accordance with agreed conditions and procedures.

(2) No patent application with respect to any such classified invention or discovery may be filed in any country not a party to this Agreement except as may be agreed and subject to Article IX.

(3) Appropriate secrecy or prohibition orders shall be issued for the purpose of giving effect to this paragraph.

ARTICLE VIII

Classification policies

Agreed classification policies shall be maintained with respect to all information, materials, equipment and devices exchanged under this Agreement. The Parties intend to continue the present practice of consultation with each other on the classification of these matters.

ARTICLE IX

Guaranties

The Parties guarantee that:

A. All classified material, equipment, devices and classified information exchanged under this Agreement shall be safeguarded in accordance with the applicable security arrangements between the Commission and the Authority.

B. No material, equipment or device transferred pursuant to this Agreement shall be used for atomic weapons or for research on or development of atomic weapons, or for any other military purpose.

C. No material, equipment, device, or restricted data transferred pursuant to this Agreement, and no equipment or device which would disclose any restricted data transferred pursuant to this Agreement, shall be transferred to any unauthorized person or beyond the jurisdiction of the country receiving it, without the written consent of the Party to this Agreement from which or by permission of which it was received. Such consent will not be given on behalf of the Government of the United States unless the transfer in respect of which it is requested is within the scope of an agreement for cooperation made in accordance with Section 123 of the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

ARTICLE X

Definitions

For the purposes of this Agreement:

"Atomic weapon" means any device utilizing atomic energy, exclusive of the means for transporting or propelling the device (where such means is a separable and divisible part of the device), the principal purpose of which is for use as, or for development of, a weapon, a weapon prototype, or a weapon test device.

"The Authority" means the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority.

"Byproduct material" means any radioactive material (except special nuclear material) yielded in or made radioactive by exposure to the radiation incident to the process of producing or utilizing special nuclear material.

"Classified" means a security designation of "Confidential" or higher applied under the laws and regulations of either the United Kingdom or the United States to any data, information, materials, services or any other matter, and includes "restricted data".

"The Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

"Equipment and devices" and "equipment or device" means any instrument, apparatus, or facility and includes any facility, except an atomic weapon, capable of making use of or producing special nuclear material, and component parts thereof.

"Person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, group, government agency or government corporation other than the Commission and the Authority.

"Pilot plant" means a device operated to acquire specific data for the design of a full-scale plant and which utilizes the process, or a portion thereof, and the type of equipment which would be used in the full-scale production plant.

"Reactor" means an apparatus, other than an atomic weapon, in which a self-supporting fission chain reaction is maintained by utilizing uranium, plutonium, or thorium or any combination of uranium, plutonium, or thorium.

"Restricted data" means all data concerning (1) design, manufacture, or utilization of atomic weapons; (2) the production of special nuclear material; or (3) the use of special nuclear material in the production of energy, but shall not include data declassified or removed from the category of restricted data by the appropriate authority.

"Special nuclear material" means (1) plutonium, uranium enriched in the isotope 233 or in the isotope 235, and any other material which the Commission or the authority determines to be special nuclear material; or (2) any material artificially enriched by any of the foregoing.

ARTICLE XI

Period of agreement

This agreement shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall receive from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement and shall remain in force for a period of 10 years.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this agreement.

Done at Washington this 15th day of June 1955, in two original texts.

For the Government of the United States of America:

ROBERT MURPHY,
LEWIS STRAUSS.

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

R. H. SCOTT.

UNITED STATES,
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the attached Agreement for Cooperation on the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the United States of America, and authorize its execution by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

As you know, Great Britain has from the beginning been one of the leaders in the development of atomic energy. Her scientists include great names in nuclear research, and her research and experimental centers are among the finest and most advanced in the world. British endeavor in the field of atomic energy preceded World War II, but in 1943 all work in this field was suspended in the British Isles, and the leading English scientists came to the United States and to Canada to labor jointly with the scientists of those countries in the development of the atomic bomb. The immense contribution made by the United Kingdom in the great scientific achievement which resulted is a matter of recorded history. Since the war, the United Kingdom has developed and put into effect an impressive, comprehensive, and highly integrated atomic-energy program; but collaboration and the exchange of atomic-energy information between our two Governments was, until the passage of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, severely limited by law. The proposed agreement, negotiated under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, represents an important step toward achieving in the field of the peaceful uses of atomic energy the friendly tradition of cooperation which prevails in the other areas of our relationships with Her Majesty's Government and will result in mutual benefit.

The agreement calls for reciprocal assistance in the achievement of the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, for the exchange of information between the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority of classified and unclassified information relating to the application of atomic energy for peaceful uses (including such general information on design and characteristics of various types of reactors as is required to permit evaluation and comparison of their potential use in a power production program), for an exchange of research materials not available commercially, for the use of research and reactor testing facilities, and for the transfer of equipment and devices. However, of the information which is classified, only that relevant to current or projective programs will be exchanged. The parties to the agreement will not exchange restricted data under the agreement which is primarily of military significance nor will they grant access to facilities which are primarily of military significance. Further, it is specifically provided that the parties will not transport or export, or permit the transfer or export, under the agreement of any material, equipment, or device which is primarily of a military character; and, further, that the disposition and utilization of atomic weapons and the exchange of restricted data relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons shall be outside the scope of the agreement.

Special nuclear material will be exchanged under the agreement only for research purposes and in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, subject to the general limitation that no material which is primarily of a military character will be transferred.

The reciprocal arrangement set forth in the proposed agreement will permit the scientists and technicians of the United States access to valuable atomic information developed in the United Kingdom and will make possible a close collaboration in investigating the effective peacetime uses of atomic energy and in advancing the frontiers of knowledge in the nuclear sciences. The limits of nuclear energy cannot now be predicted, but its promise for the more abundant life is infinite. Working together the scientists of these two great nations can contribute substantially to the fulfillment of

that promise. In this way, each Government will be promoting its own defense and security and substantially furthering the mutual security of the peoples of the free world.

It is, therefore, the opinion of the Commission that the proposed agreement not only is in accordance with the policy which you have established concerning the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in collaboration with friendly foreign nations but, also, that the cooperative effort which the proposed agreement will permit will further solidify the friendship we now enjoy with Her Majesty's Government and go far in assuring the continuance of peace and freedom in our countries.

Respectfully,

LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 15, 1955.

The Honorable L. L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of June 15, 1955, the Atomic Energy Commission recommended that I approve a proposed agreement for cooperation concerning the civil uses of atomic energy by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the United States of America.

The Commission's letter of recommendation refers to the close collaboration that existed between Great Britain and the United States in the development of the atomic bomb, and points out that since the war and until the passage of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, further cooperation in atomic-energy development was severely limited by law. The Commission's letter also states that the United Kingdom has developed and put into effect a comprehensive atomic-energy program, and that the proposed agreement, negotiated under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, represents an important step toward achieving in the atomic-energy field the friendly tradition of cooperation which prevails in the other areas of our relationships with Her Majesty's Government.

I have examined the agreement recommended. I share in the belief of the Commission that the performance of the agreement will result in mutual benefit to both Governments.

The agreement calls for an exchange of classified and unclassified information relating to the application of atomic energy for peaceful uses, for an exchange of research materials not available commercially, for the use of research and reactor testing facilities, and for the transfer of equipment and devices. It is provided, however, that classified information will be exchanged only when relevant to current or projected programs, and that the parties to the agreement will not exchange restricted data under the agreement which is primarily of military significance; nor will they grant access to facilities which are primarily of military significance. Further, it is specifically provided that the parties will not transfer or export, or permit the transfer or export, under the agreement, of any material, equipment, or device which is primarily of a military significance. It is specifically provided that the disposition and utilization of atomic weapons and the exchange of restricted data relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons shall be outside the scope of the agreement.

Special nuclear material will be exchanged under the agreement only for research purposes and in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, subject to the general limitation that nuclear material which is primarily of a military character will not be transferred.

The extent of the progress of atomic energy development in Great Britain, particularly in the matter of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, makes it certain that the United States will gain materially from a mutual exchange of information and the mutual uses of facilities. The proposed agreement will permit our scientists to have access to valuable information which the eminent scientists of the United Kingdom have developed and will make possible a close collaboration in advancing the frontiers of knowledge in the nuclear sciences and the fulfillment of the promise which nuclear energy holds for all mankind. I share the opinion of the Commission that the activities called for in the agreement will promote the defense and security of the United States and will substantially further the mutual security of the peoples of the free world.

Accordingly, pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby—

(1) Approve the within proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland concerning the civil uses of atomic energy;

(2) Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States; and

(3) Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT EISENHOWER.

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1955.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic
Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123 (c) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 there is submitted with this letter:

(1) A proposed Agreement for Cooperation with the Government of the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland;

(2) A letter dated June 15, 1955 from the Commission to the President recommending his approval of the proposed agreement;

(3) A letter dated June 15, 1955 from the President to the Commission approving the proposed agreement, authorizing its execution, and containing his determination that the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

This proposed agreement for cooperation calls for the exchange of classified and unclassified information and material, including restricted data, and is more extensive in scope than the unclassified research agreements which previously have been submitted to this session of the Congress.

The arrangement contained in the proposed agreement results from the special relationship which exists between the Government of the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland and the United States in the atomic energy field.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND FOR COOPERATION REGARDING ATOMIC INFORMATION FOR MUTUAL DEFENSE PURPOSES

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,

Recognizing that their mutual security and defense requires that they be prepared to meet the contingencies of atomic warfare,

Recognizing that their common interests will be advanced by the exchange of information pertinent thereto,

Believing that the exchange of such information can be undertaken without threat to the security of either country, and

Taking into consideration the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954, which was prepared with these purposes in mind,

Agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

1. While the United States and the United Kingdom are participating in international arrangements for their mutual defense and security and making substantial and material contribution thereto, each Government will from time to time make available to the other Government atomic information which the Government making such information available deems necessary to:

(a) the development of defense plans;

(b) the training of personnel in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons; and

(c) the evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons.

2. Atomic information which is transferred by either Government pursuant to this Agreement shall be used by the other Government exclusively for the preparation and implementation of defense plans in the mutual interests of the two countries.

ARTICLE II

1. All transfers of atomic information to the United Kingdom by the United States pursuant to this Agreement will be made in compliance with the provisions of the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and any subsequent applicable United States legislation. All transfers of atomic information to the United States by the United Kingdom pursuant to this Agreement will be made in compliance with the United Kingdom Official Secrets Acts, 1911–1939, and the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

2. Under this Agreement there will be no transfers by the United States or the United Kingdom of atomic weapons or special nuclear material, as these terms are defined in Section 11d, and Section 11t, of the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

ARTICLE III

1. Atomic information made available pursuant to this Agreement shall be accorded full security protection under applicable security arrangements between the United States and the United Kingdom and applicable national legislation and regulations of the two countries. In no case shall either Government maintain security standards for safeguarding atomic information made available pursuant to this Agreement lower than those set forth in the applicable security arrangements in effect on the date this Agreement comes into force.

2. Atomic information which is exchanged pursuant to this Agreement will be made available through channels existing or hereafter agreed for the exchange of classified defense information between the two Governments.

3. Atomic information received pursuant to this Agreement shall not be transferred by the recipient Government to any unauthorized person or, except as provided in Article V of this Agreement, beyond the jurisdiction of that Government. Each Government may stipulate the degree to which any of the categories of information made available to the other Government pursuant to this Agreement may be disseminated, may specify the categories of persons who may have access to such information, and may impose such other restrictions on the dissemination of such information as it deems necessary.

ARTICLE IV

As used in this Agreement, "atomic information" means:

(a) so far as concerns the information provided by the United States, Restricted Data, as defined in Section 11 r. of the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954, which is permitted to be communicated pursuant to the provisions of Section 144 b. of that Act, and information relating primarily to the military utilization of atomic weapons which has been removed from the Restricted Data category in accordance with the provisions of Section 142 d. of the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954;

(b) so far as concerns the information provided by the United Kingdom, information exchanged under this Agreement which is either classified atomic energy information or other United Kingdom defense information which it is decided to transfer to the United States in pursuance of Article I of this Agreement.

ARTICLE V

Nothing herein shall be interpreted or operate as a bar or restriction to consultation and cooperation by the United States or the United Kingdom with other nations or regional organizations in any fields of defense. Neither Government, however, shall communicate atomic information made available by the other Government pursuant to this Agreement to any nation or regional organization unless the same information has been made available to that nation or regional organization by the other Government in accordance with its own legislative requirements and except to the extent that such communication is expressely authorized by such other Government.

ARTICLE VI

This Agreement shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall receive from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such an Agreement, and shall remain in effect until terminated by mutual agreement of both Governments.

Done at Washington this Fifteenth day of June 1955 in two original texts.

For the United States of America:

C. BURKE ELBRICK.

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

R. H. SCOTT.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, June 14, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Section 144 (b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 empowers you to authorize the Department of Defense, with the assistance of the Atomic Energy Commission, to cooperate with another nation or regional defense organization to which the United States is a party and to communicate to that nation or organization such atomic information as is necessary to the development of defense plans, the training of personnel in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons, and the evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons. This cooperation and communication, however, may be undertaken only in accordance with the limitations imposed by the act and under an agreement entered into pursuant to section 123 thereof.

The first of these agreements was with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It was approved by you on April 13, 1955, and has been before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for the required 30-day period. With the cooperation of the Department of State, a separate agreement has now been negotiated with the United Kingdom and recommended for signature. This proposed agreement is submitted herewith for your approval.

It is the view of this Department that this agreement is entirely in accord with the provision of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. I am convinced that it will fully serve the best interests of the United States by making possible a further significant extension of the close cooperation in the field of mutual defense which has characterized our relationships with the United Kingdom for so many years. I therefore strongly recommend that you approve this proposed agreement as required by section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act and transmit the agreement to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy together with your determinations and authorizations as to execution.

With great respect, I am
Faithfully yours,

C. E. WILSON.

JUNE 15, 1955.

The Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, I hereby submit to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy a proposed agreement between the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom for cooperation regarding communication of atomic information for mutual defense purposes under section 144 (b) of the act.

Under the terms of the proposed agreement, the United States may exchange with the United Kingdom, so long as the United Kingdom pursuant to an international arrangement continues to make substantial and material contributions to the mutual defense effort, atomic information which the United States considers necessary to (1) the development of defense plans; (2) the training of personnel in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons; and (3) the evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons.

The United Kingdom will make atomic information available to the United States on the same basis.

Atomic information made available pursuant to the proposed agreement will not be transferred to unauthorized persons, or beyond the jurisdiction of the recipient government except where that information is to be communicated to another nation or regional organization which has already been given the same information under an agreement similar to this and then only to the extent such transfer is specifically authorized by the originating government.

Transfers of atomic information by the United States under the proposed agreement will be made only in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and such information will be safeguarded by the stringent security arrangements in effect between the United States and the United Kingdom when this agreement comes into force.

The agreement will remain in effect until terminated by agreement between the two governments, but the actual exchange of atomic information is entirely discretionary.

The Department of Defense has strongly recommended approval of this agreement. It is my firm conviction that through the cooperative measures foreseen in this agreement we will have aided materially not only in strengthening our own defenses but also those of our British ally and will thereby contribute greatly to the mutual defense efforts which are of such vital importance to the maintenance of our common freedom.

Accordingly, I hereby determine that the performance of this proposed agreement will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security, and approve this agreement. In addition, I hereby authorize, subject to the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the Secretary of State to execute the proposed agreement and the Department of Defense, with the assistance of the Atomic Energy Commission, to cooperate with the United Kingdom and to communicate restricted data to the United Kingdom under the agreement.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA FOR COOPERATION REGARDING ATOMIC INFORMATION FOR MUTUAL DEFENSE PURPOSES

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada,

Recognizing that their mutual security and defense requires that they be prepared to meet the contingencies of atomic warfare,

Recognizing that their common interests will be advanced by the exchange of information pertinent thereto,

Believing that the exchange of such information can be undertaken without threat to the security of either country, and

Taking into consideration the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and the Canadian Atomic Energy Control Act and Atomic Energy Regulations, which were prepared with these purposes in mind,

Agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

1. While the United States and Canada are participating in international arrangements for their mutual defense and security and making substantial and material contribution thereto, each Government will from time to time make available to the other Government atomic information which the Government making such information available deems necessary to:

(a) the development of defense plans;

(b) the training of personnel in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons; and

(c) the evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons.

2. Atomic information which is transferred by either Government pursuant to this Agreement shall be used by the other Government exclusively for the preparation and implementation of defense plans in the mutual interests of the two countries.

ARTICLE II

1. All transfers of atomic information to Canada by the United States pursuant to this Agreement will be made in compliance with the provisions of the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and any subsequent applicable United States legislation. All transfers of atomic information to the United States by Canada pursuant to this Agreement will be made in compliance with the Atomic Energy Control Act and the Atomic Energy Regulations of Canada or subsequent applicable Canadian legislation and regulations.

2. Under this Agreement there will be no transfers by the United States or Canada of atomic weapons or special nuclear material, as these terms are defined in Section 11 d. and Section 11 t. of the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

ARTICLE III

1. Atomic information made available pursuant to this Agreement shall be accorded full security protection under applicable security arrangements between the United States and Canada and applicable national legislation and regulations of the two countries. In no case shall either Government maintain security standards for safeguarding atomic information made available pursuant to this Agreement lower than those set forth in the applicable security arrangements in

effect on the date this Agreement comes into force.

2. Atomic information which is exchanged pursuant to this Agreement will be made available through channels existing or hereafter agreed for the exchange of classified defense information between the two Governments.

3. Atomic information received pursuant to this Agreement shall not be transferred by the recipient Government to any unauthorized person or, except as provided in Article V of this Agreement, beyond the jurisdiction of that Government. Each Government may stipulate the degree to which any of the categories of information made available to the other Government pursuant to this Agreement may be disseminated, may specify the categories of persons who may have access to such information, and may impose such other restrictions on the dissemination of such information as it deems necessary.

ARTICLE IV

As used in this Agreement, "atomic information" means:

(a) so far as concerns the information provided by the United States, Restricted Data, as defined in Section 11 r. of the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954, which is permitted to be communicated pursuant to the provisions of Section 144 b. of that Act and information relating primarily to the military utilization of atomic weapons which has been removed from the Restricted Data category in accordance with the provisions of Section 142 d. of the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954;

(b) so far as concerns the information provided by Canada, classified information relating to the military application of atomic energy.

ARTICLE V

Nothing herein shall be interpreted or operate as a bar or restriction to consultation and cooperation by the United States or Canada with other nations or regional organizations in any fields of defense. Neither Government, however, shall communicate atomic information made available by the other Government pursuant to this Agreement to any nation or regional organization unless the same information has been made available to that nation or regional organization by the other Government in accordance with its own legislative requirements and except to the extent that such communication is expressly authorized by such other Government.

ARTICLE VI

This Agreement shall enter into force on the date of receipt by the Government of Canada of a notification from the Government of the United States of America that the period of thirty days required by Section 123 c. of the U. S. Atomic Energy Act of 1954 has elapsed, and shall remain in effect until terminated by mutual agreement of both Governments.

Done at Washington this fifteenth day of June 1955 in two original texts.

For the United States of America:

C. BURKE ELBRICK.

For Canada:

A. D. P. HEENEY.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, June 10, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Section 144 (b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 empowers you to authorize the Department of Defense, with the assistance of the Atomic Energy Commission, to cooperate with another nation or regional defense organization to which the United States is a party and to communicate to that nation or organization such atomic information as is necessary to the development of defense plans, the training of personnel in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons, and the evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons. This cooperation and communication, however, may be undertaken only in accordance with the limitations imposed by the act and under an agreement entered into pursuant to section 123 thereof.

The first of these agreements was with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It was approved by you on April 13, 1955, and has been before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for the required 30-day period. With the cooperation of the Department of State, a separate agreement has now been negotiated with Canada and recommended for signature. This proposed agreement is submitted herewith for your approval.

It is the view of this Department that this agreement is entirely in accord with the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The execution of this agreement should do much to advance our mutual defense interests, especially the vital cause of North American defense in which we have long been working closely with our Canadian neighbors, and will thereby aid materially in the defense of the United States. I therefore strongly recommend that you approve this proposed agreement as required by section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act and transmit the agreement to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, together with your determinations and authorizations as to execution.

With great respect, I am,
Faithfully yours,

C. E. WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 15, 1955.

The Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, I hereby submit to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy a proposed agreement between the Governments of the United States and Canada for cooperation regarding communication of atomic information for mutual defense purposes under section 144 (b) of the act.

Under the terms of the proposed agreement, the United States may exchange with Canada, so long as Canada pursuant to an international arrangement continues to make substantial and material contributions to the mutual defense effort, atomic information which the United States considers necessary to (1) the development of defense plans; (2) the training of personnel in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons; and (3) the evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons. Canada will make atomic information available to the United States on the same basis.

Atomic information made available pursuant to the proposed agreement will not be transferred to unauthorized persons, or beyond the jurisdiction of the recipient government except where that information is to be communicated to another nation or regional organization which has already been given the same information under an agreement similar to this and then only to the extent such transfer is specifically authorized by the originating government.

Transfers of atomic information by the United States under the proposed agreement will be made only in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and such information will be safeguarded by the stringent security arrangements in effect between the United States and Canada when this agreement comes into force.

The agreement will remain in effect until terminated by agreement between the two governments, but the actual exchange of atomic information is entirely discretionary.

The Department of Defense has strongly recommended approval of this agreement. It is my firm conviction that through the cooperative measures foreseen in this agreement we will have aided materially not only in strengthening our own defenses but also those of our Canadian ally and will thereby contribute greatly to the mutual defense efforts which are of such vital importance to the maintenance of our common freedom.

Accordingly, I hereby determine that the performance of this proposed agreement will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and approve this agreement. In addition, I hereby authorize, subject to the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the Secretary of State to execute the proposed agreement and the Department of Defense, with the assistance of the Atomic Energy Commission, to cooperate with Canada and to communicate restricted data to Canada under the agreement.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for today may be transferred to Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HELEN KELLER

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, when Harvard University lifted its centuries-old ban and presented an honorary degree to a woman for the first time, it chose as the recipient of this great honor a woman who has been an inspiration to all who know her story, one who has shown how the human spirit can triumph over physical handicaps and whose life has been one of faith, trust, and helpfulness, Helen Keller.

In presenting her with a doctorate of laws, Dr. Pusey stated:

From a still, dark world she has brought us light and sound. Our lives are richer for her faith and her example.

I believe everyone will agree with his statement and rejoice that she has been so honored by this great university.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks the following stirring editorial by a very fine writer for the Boston Sunday Globe describing this award:

THE WOMAN HARVARD CHOSE TO HONOR

(By Frances Burns)

Nearly 10 years ago, on a dull November day, a stoutish, vivacious woman in a blue feather toque stood with a middle-aged friend beside a sailor in a high bed in Chelsea Naval Hospital.

Before she had moved confidently, guided by the gentle pressure of her companion's fingers, down the ward between the rows of beds, the sailor had been blank, uncommunicative. The war was over, but the shipboard explosion in the battle for Leyte still would keep his young body immobilized for many months. He was bored and rebellious.

Then Helen Keller smiled down at him. She felt for his hand and clasped it. She spoke to him in a rush of words, gutturally, with the uninflection of those who cannot hear what they say, but her words conveyed genuine sympathy and compassion.

And the sailor responded, as wounded men everywhere had responded, to the personality of this woman. Here she was, one of the best-known people in the world—honored everywhere, received by Presidents and Kings and Premiers—asking no favors of him for her affliction, but giving of herself for him and others who were afflicted.

(This dame couldn't see or hear—and she hadn't let it get her down. She made him think of his grandmother a little—kind and full of advice. She couldn't see or hear and she didn't talk too good. He still had his eyes and ears, spite of what had happened. Maybe.)

Outside the long windows nothing had changed in the monotones of dun grass, gray skies, cold gray mystic flowing past sooty buildings and dark mountains of coal under the gray green of the high, graceful bridge. But there in the ward there was a new warmth of spirit from a blind and deaf woman. All the sick and wounded felt it. Even the reporter, instinctively resisting the world's publicized and extolled, was caught up in it.

Now, a decade later, a few days before her 75th birthday, Harvard has chosen Helen Keller to be the first woman in 309 commencements ever to receive an honorary degree.

"SHE HAS BROUGHT US LIGHT"

When the university finally decided to take its ultimate step in recognizing women, it paid tribute to one who has shown the world that the human spirit can triumph over physical handicap.

"From a still, dark world, she has brought us light and sound," said Mr. Pusey, presenting her with a doctorate of laws. "Our lives are richer for her faith and her example."

Harvard had resisted women in education longest of all the institutions in the country. Only step by step has the university given ground. The medical school admitted the other sex in 1945 and has had 87 women as students since; the law school broke down in 1950, with some 60 enrolled in the years since.

But, though Helen Keller was graduated cum laude from Radcliffe in 1904, it was not to the intellectual, nor to the administrator, the politician or stateswoman, the leader in profession or education, that Harvard first doffed its hat.

Rather it was to the woman who has overcome self in conquering physical handicap, whose life has been lived in faith and trust and helpfulness.

AGE HAS NOT SLOWED HER

Age has not withered her, nor slowed her down, nor dampened her spirit. Indeed, as she approached her 75th birthday, she pledged herself to redouble her efforts in behalf of the American Foundation for the Blind and the American Foundation for Overseas Blind—"to bring the light of human dignity and usefulness into the darkened lives of the world's 14 million slightless."

She has lived to see herself become a legend. Unlike many legends hers is founded on fact and truth. Born a normal child, she was 19 months old when disease destroyed her hearing and sight. Too young to have stored the memory of color and sound, of flowers and the faces of those she loved, or the sound of voices or music, no longer now to be reached by admonition or displeasure, she became a half-wild little creature, babbling, savage, undisciplined.

It was out of this material that her own indomitable inheritance and two remarkable teachers and companions, Anne Sullivan (Macy)—"Teacher"—and Polly Thomson, have fashioned the woman that the world knows and honors.

Like Lazarus, bursting the bonds of the grave, like Schweitzer overcoming the blackness of Africa at Lamarene, Helen Keller has conquered the darkness and silence. She is not the only person to see without eyes, or hear without ears but it is nonetheless an achievement of the spirit that she has been able to bring about what seems to the ordinary normal human a miracle. Nor does it detract from her accomplishment to say that she could not have done what she did without the devotion and of teaching and patience contributed by Mrs. Macy and Miss Thomson.

Actually, the peculiar contribution of her genius is that, spurred, rather than deterred, by her physical and intellectual limitations she has been able to influence the attitudes of the people of this and other countries toward the deformed and handicapped.

For she has lifted from the area of pity and apartness the poor suffering, into the life that they want to share with the sighted and hearing and whole.

WE WANT WHAT OTHERS DO

Pity for the handicapped appeared comparatively recently in man's climb upward from the savage. It is one of the nobler instincts of the Christian religion. Yet it is, after all, only a conscious step from the dread and loathing which led the animals to destroy the weak and primitive man to leave the handicapped to die.

But is a man any less a man because he is missing one of his senses, or has suffered the handicap of being born the wrong color, or religion, or race? Has he any less capacity to love and hate, any poorer brain, or smaller heart, or fewer drives, or less ambition because he has lost sight, or limb, or beauty of face, is different?

Miss Keller herself has said that "too many of the more fortunate look upon a blind person as very different from themselves. But this is not true. Pain is pain, and joy, ambition, and love belong to us just as much as they do to those who can see. We want exactly what others do * * *."

As much as anyone living she has broken the barrier of prejudice and pity against the handicapped. By her own life, by her disregard of blindness and deafness, she has shown that the deformed are not half men, but may, indeed, like her be supermen.

She is a world symbol of those most admirable qualities of the human spirit, courage, determination, patience, sympathy, love.

And out of her own conquest of darkness and silence has come the living proof that she and other humans like her are no different from run of the mill men and women, except that more is demanded of them if they are to live to the fullest with the endowment which they share with their fellow man.

THE LATE HONORABLE DAVID WORTH CLARK

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, it is with the deepest feeling of regret that I announce the death of David Worth Clark, former distinguished Member of this body.

D. Worth, as he was known in the House and by his many friends, was born on April 2, 1902, at Idaho Falls, in Bonneville County, Idaho. He attended the public schools of Idaho and subsequently graduated from Notre Dame University at the age of 19. He then attended and graduated from the law department at Harvard University in 1925, and was admitted to practice his profession in the State of Idaho in that year.

D. Worth Clark had a very distinguished career as an attorney-at-law. He had a very distinguished career as a Member of this body during the 74th and 75th Congresses, at which time he was elected to the United States Senate, where he served with distinction from 1939 to 1945. He was a man of extremely friendly attributes, great capabilities and the fullest sincerity and devotion to duty. He leaves a lovely and devoted wife and a marvelous family. His friends will miss him, and I know that many Members of this body will feel very shocked at his early demise.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it has been a long, long time since I have been as shocked as I was at the news I received this morning of D. Worth Clark's passing. He and I came to Congress in the same year. Our first offices were in the New House Office Building adjacent to one another. Initially by reason of that, but later by reason of many other mutual interests, Worth and I came to be very close personal friends. He was a member of the Democratic Party. I am a member of the Republican Party. Through all the years, though we differed in many things that had to do with partisan activities, we found genuine pleasure in each other's companionship.

His wife, Virgil, who survives, likewise was and is a good friend of mine, as well as of Mrs. Halleck. The Worth children and ours, more or less, grew up together. I shall always remember Worth Clark as one of the ablest men of my time in this Congress. He had a wonderful mind. With it all he had a great sense of balance, together with sound judgment that made him an outstanding legislator. He was a courageous man, a man who was always ready to stand up and fight for his principles.

His was an integrity of character that commanded the respect of his colleagues on either side of the aisle.

I never knew Worth Clark to be other than kind and generous. Those who looked to him for help found a willing hand, ready to serve; those of us who were privileged, in our turn, to repay, in some measure, his thoughtful gestures, were assured of his sincere gratitude.

He was a great American, a devoted father, and a steadfast friend. I find it difficult to reconcile myself to the loss of this admirable man, and I mourn with his wife and three fine daughters the passing that has been so untimely.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I, too, should like to add my expression of sympathy to Virgil Clark and to the family of our late colleague with whom I was

privileged to serve since my arrival in Washington. While we were both of the same party, we too had our differences, especially in the difficult days of 1938 and 1939 when our late colleague in his fine, typical, intelligent, and gentle fashion took a position and recognized the right of others and respected them in that right of differing with him, but which he did always in his own inimitable and gracious way.

I am truly shocked at his sudden passing, for he was a young man and deserved a longer time to serve his country in the future as he did in the past.

My sympathy to his family is heartfelt.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and public service of this fine man.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, both my State of Idaho and the country at large lost a fine and dedicated citizen in the untimely death this week of David Worth Clark. A Member of the House of Representatives from 1935 to 1939, and of the United States Senate from 1939 to 1945, he distinguished himself for his courage, his integrity, and his willingness to fight for the things in which he believed.

Although his life was cut short in its prime—he was only 53—the years he lived were crowded ones. He was 33 when he first came to Washington as a Member of Congress. He had already practiced law for 7 years in his hometown of Pocatello, and had served for 2 years as Idaho's assistant attorney general. After leaving the United States Senate, he maintained law offices in both Washington, D. C., and the West, served as a management consultant, and took care of business interests scattered throughout this country and Hawaii.

D. Worth, as he was known, was a man of great personal charm. Few men have had more devoted friends. They loved him for his great heart and his understanding as well as for his keen mind and splendid judgment. I was not in Washington, of course, when he was here, but many Members have spoken to me about the deep affection and high regard in which they, his colleagues, held him.

My heart goes out to his wonderful wife, Virgil Irwin Clark, and his three lovely daughters in their loss. I hope they can find comfort in the legacy of accomplishment left by Senator Worth Clark to both his State and his Nation.

THE LATE HONORABLE BARTEL J. JONKMAN

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to report to the Members of the House of Representatives that funeral services were held last Thursday afternoon for the Honorable Bartel J. Jonkman, who served in this body from 1940 until 1948. Mr. Jonkman died on Monday, June 13, in Grand Rapids, Mich., at the age of 71.

Barney Jonkman unselfishly and sincerely gave most of his life to public service. Upon graduation from the University of Michigan Law School in 1914, he was appointed assistant prosecuting attorney for Kent County, Mich., in which capacity he served until 1920.

Mr. Jonkman was elected prosecuting attorney of his home county in 1929 and served until 1936. The Honorable Fred N. Searl, now circuit judge in Kent County, acted as Mr. Jonkman's chief assistant. Last Monday Mr. Searl said:

> It was my privilege to serve with Mr. Jonkman during the 5 years of his service as prosecuting attorney. He conducted that office with courage, integrity, and good judgment, and had the respect and affection of all who served with him.

In 1940 the voters of the Fifth District selected Barney Jonkman to represent them in Congress. This was at a special election called to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Representatives Carl E. Mapes. While in Congress Barney was an active member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and traveled extensively in Europe and South America. He went to Alaska in 1947 to inspect the Alcan Highway project.

At an early date Representative Jonkman was conscious of the dangers of communistic influence in our Government. As a one man subcommittee he was active in the investigation of Communists in the State Department. Speaking of these years of service, Judge Searl said:

> As Representative in Congress he served this district and the Nation well during the difficult war years. Bartel Jonkman was a fine citizen and public officer.

Mr. Jonkman was a charter member of the Sherman Street Christian Reformed Church where the funeral services were held on Thursday.

Mr. Speaker, to the widow and to Mr. Jonkman's three daughters, and to the other members of his devoted family, we extend our personal sympathy.

Michigan has lost a fine citizen.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include editorials from three Fifth District newspapers on the passing of Bartel J. Jonkman. They are from the Holland Sentinel, the Grand Rapids Herald, and the Grand Rapids Press:

[From the Holland Sentinel]

CONGRESSMAN BARTEL J. JONKMAN

Bartel J. Jonkman, former Kent County prosecutor and our Congressman from the Fifth Congressional District of Michigan, died Monday at the age of 3 score and 11 years.

Congressman Jonkman served the Fifth Congressional District from 1940 to 1948. He was a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and began his public career in 1914 assistant Kent County prosecuting attorney. Entering private law practice in 1920, he was elected county prosecutor of Kent County in 1929, leaving this post in 1936. Then, in 1940, he was elected at a special election to fill a vacancy caused by the death of Representative Carl Mapes, whom thousands of citizens in the Fifth District remember, along with Bartel J. Jonkman.

We seem to have the habit of retaining our Congressmen in the Fifth District for more than a term. Bartel Jonkman served more than 40 years in public office, which was more than one-half of his entire life. This is quite a record for any man. The Congressman is survived by his wife, 5 brothers, and 2 sisters. The community will miss the Congressman.

[From the Grand Rapids Herald]

BARTEL JONKMAN

The passing of Bartel J. Jonkman takes from the community one who was an active figure in public life for many years.

As prosecuting attorney of Kent County, and later as a Member of Congress, serving the Fifth District for four terms, he was an earnest official servant, conservative in his viewpoint, steadfastly declining to embrace the political foibles of his time, but usually retaining an open mind before deciding what he deemed to be the best interests of his country and his district. In Washington he was respected by his colleagues.

At the close of his congressional career, in 1949, Mr. Jonkman returned to his native city of Grand Rapids and resumed his law practice. In failing health, he retired from active participation in politics but never lost his deep interest in public questions.

He will be missed by a large circle of friends and neighbors.

[From the Grand Rapids Press]

BARTEL J. JONKMAN

Bartel J. Jonkman, who died Monday at the age of 71, spent most of his adult life in public office. He first came to prominence in this community as Kent County prosecuting attorney, a position he held for 7 years.

The name he made for himself in this position assured his election as Representative from the Fifth District on the death of Representative Carl E. Mapes. Like his predecessor, Mr. Jonkman gave studious attention to the needs of his district. He sometimes complained, privately, that too much of his time was being taken up with the individual affairs of his constituents; too many of them made demands on his time with minor requests for services or favors. But he looked after all of them.

Despite these distractions, he still managed to handle a large volume of official work and was one of the first men in Washington to call attention to the dangers of Communist infiltration. He captured few headlines, but, nevertheless, laid the foundation for much of the work that was done later to expose the extent of the Communist menace throughout the Western Hemisphere.

Barney, as most persons around here knew him, served in Congress from 1939 to 1948. If he had remained longer he probably would have come to be classed as a Taft Republican, for he leaned definitely to the conservative side and was inclined to take the isolationist view.

He might have remained in Congress even longer if he had been willing to compromise his personal views. Perhaps he knew that he had fallen out of step with the voters of his district; but he wouldn't wear someone else's colors. His sincerity won him the respect of all who knew him, including those who often disagreed with him. It was that quality that made him both a good citizen and a firm friend.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we of the Foreign Affairs Committee have missed Mr. Jonkman very

much since he left the committee. Now that he has gone beyond where we can confer with him, now that he has gone beyond where we can have his word, his counsel, we shall miss him even more.

I remember the wonderful times we used to have over the use of two words. As a result we used to call Bart Mr. Deems Jonkman. He was a lawyer and he maintained that the word "deems" meant that if "the President deems" such and such a thing is right it never comes back to the Congress but if he just finds it is right, we would get it back here for our O. K. again. So Bart tried over and over again to get the word "deems" out of our legislation and to substitute therefor the word "finds." Finally just before he left the committee we were considering a bill that came to us with the word "finds" in it. We had a real celebration.

He was so honest, so honorable, so true. His Dutch blood stood us and him in good stead and did much for all of us. He was steady, grim sometimes, determined always to get things done, if possible. His sense of what America meant to the world was deep. His love of country was so true, so constant, so unwavering. He worked always with a quiet, steady purpose giving himself unstintingly to the work in hand.

To the members of his family we of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House express our deep sympathy, our sense of deprivation that is theirs and ours in his going. I feel certain that a man who lived as he did, who did so much for his country, will surely be able to do even more in those larger areas to which he has gone.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am positive that the members of Mr. Jonkman's family will appreciate very much the kind words of the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD in reference to the passing of the late Bartel J. Jonkman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, Bartel Jonkman was a courtly gentleman. He was a capable and sane legislator, and really served his day and generation.

THE MARINE CORPS

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to bring to the attention of the Members of the House that the other body just a short while ago on rollcall vote restored to the defense appropriation bill the cut we made in the funds for the Marine Corps. I hope indeed that when the bill comes back to the House after a conference that the House in its great and good judgment, as it always has, will accept this restoration of funds for the Marine Corps and will embrace the opportunity to concur with the other body in its action. This cut was totally unjustified and, in my opinion, totally inexplicable so far as the great United States Marine Corps is concerned.

I hope the other body sees fit to restore the cut that was made in connection with the Army as well. I shall watch with great interest the action now taking place in the other body; but at least we have restored in the other body funds for the Marine Corps. That is a good place to begin.

COMMUNISM—ITS METHOD

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, over 20 years ago I warned the people of America with reference to the threat of communism. A friend of mine sent me an article which appeared in the National Republic magazine of June 1936.

This article reads as follows:

COMMUNISM—ITS METHOD

(By JOHN W. McCORMACK)

At the outset it must be borne in mind that communism is not alone a school of political or economic science. In its fuller aspect it is a philosophy of man. It is materialistic in both its concept and operation. The purpose of communism is the establishment of a dictatorship of the so-called proletariat—through the medium of class appeal and class groupings. It seeks to obtain control of government and then through the medium of a dictator, to put into operation the principles and policies of communism.

It is unnecessary to discuss in detail the manner in which they are attempting to accomplish their objective. They openly admit the use of any and all means, legal or illegal, or a combination of both, to bring about their objective. Their efforts in this country are not confined to mere expression or academic discussion. Practical efforts are being made in every conceivable way to create dissatisfaction and discontent, to capitalize on it wherever it exists, in order to produce emotional results that will aid them in furthering their cause. They employ the "boring in" policy in labor, in education, in religion and in fraternal and other organizations, in order to obtain a position of advantage therein, so as to influence the policies of such organizations. They also employ the "united front" policy, by which they join with other organizations in the agitation of furtherance of some program. They are not interested in the program, except as a means of interesting such organizations in their cause. They join with others, not because they believe in what others fight for, but to use the strength of such organization for their advantage. To them, anything in which they engage is simply a means to the end they seek—the overthrow of government, not through the Constitution, but by force and violence. At the present time they have a school in New York City with over 2,000 students in attendance each night, receiving instructions in the philosophy of Marx and Engels, and particularly a training in acts of sabotage and in the exploitation of emotional situations. They are also trained in tactics which will prolong strikes that might properly be started in an effort to obtain higher wages or better working conditions or hours of labor. In such cases they step in, not to assist in a fair settlement, but to prolong as long as possible and they then step out, leaving behind them misery and suffering. They are not interested in settlement. They are interested only in prolongation of a strike, exploiting existing conditions, as a part of their means to an end. Their training is to enable them to induce others, who have nothing in common with them, to unconsciously play their game. They oppose all governments except Sovietism. They do not owe allegiance to any flag but the red flag of revolution. They are unscrupulous in their demands and in their consideration of the rights of others. They have been making a determined effort for years to bore in on the American Federation of Labor. In 1 or 2 cases they have been successful in obtaining control of a union. I have in mind a union in New York City. The leadership of the American Federation of Labor, under President Green, are militantly fighting such efforts. President Green realizes the danger. In the past little outside attention has been given to the great fight he and his colleagues have been waging. His great work should receive the attention and praise to which it is entitled. Business men should cooperate with President Green. It is to the advantage of business in dealing with unions to deal with men of the type of Green—men who stand for his kind of leadership in meeting this problem.

I have referred to a Communist union in New York City, originally affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. The special committee of which I was chairman investigated this union and found that it forced certain businessmen of New York to pay tribute to it in order to continue in business.

The union imposed a so-called unemployment tax of 3 percent of the total payroll of over 200 businessmen in the fur business; also exacting a similar amount from the employees, after forcing them to join the union, then using the money thus obtained for the purposes of communism. This evidence was the sworn testimony of businessmen who had paid the toll. We also received evidence that employees were forced to join this union, and when they resisted force was employed. American businessmen were forced to pay tribute to this un-American union, and the money obtained from them was and is being used in an effort to destroy the American Government, including the very business of these men. Some who had resisted testified that their goods were destroyed, their employees attacked and assaulted, forcing them to capitulate to the terms imposed. The evidence also showed that no employee had ever received a penny from this fund. The head of the Communist squad of the New York police department testified that this union maintained out of the funds received a gangster squad to intimidate employer and employees. Whenever any one of them was arrested the same attorney always represented them. The lieutenant testified about many attacks on employer and employees, and also that there are at least two murders, unsolved, of employees who were killed by the gangster squad of this Communist union for refusing to join this union. The police know who did it, but they cannot obtain the legal evidence.

Persons of this type should be shown no consideration. They know only the policy of force and violence. Their policy is to instill fear in the minds of others. Whenever such efforts are employed in any part of the country by Communists, with a disregard of the rights of others, action by the police and courts should be rapid. About a year ago, in a city just outside of Boston, similar methods were employed. The police acted quickly, arresting those involved, and the district attorney acted quickly, prosecuting the cases and sending the offenders to jail.

The raising of various funds for these lawbreakers is simply a part of their program.

They are not interested directly in such persons or their cases, but simply in using a particular situation as a medium of exploitation. They are not interested in legislation. They are interested only, as a means to an end, by attempting to agitate and induce good Americans to become confused, or to exploit them, and to have them unconsciously play their game. They are not interested in politics, except as a means to an end. The Communist movement is not a political party. That is where the Columbia Broadcasting Co. made its mistake recently allowing Earl Browder, head of the Communist Party of the United States, to use their facilities. If a Communist should be elected President of the United States, he could never take office.

I have noted their recent statements about a Farmer-Labor Party, urging others to join with them in this respect. There are persons in this country who believe in such a party, but who are opponents of communism. To them, such a party is intended as a means of obtaining changes in the Constitution, or new legislation in a constitutional manner. The purpose of the Communists is to use such a political party as a part of their revolutionary program. This fact should be borne in mind by Americans interested in the formation of such a party. They should not permit themselves to be deceived by the Communists. The Communists propose, so far as such a party is concerned, to obtain control of it as a means for furthering their objective. It is simply a part of their scheme. While under our law one can become a member of any political party that he desires to join, such action being voluntary on the part of the individual, nevertheless, the organizers and leaders of the Farmer-Labor Party, if one is organized nationally, either now or later, should not permit Communists to obtain control, or even to obtain a position of influence therein.

The American people are a patient people. We have been for years the fertile field of foreign propagandists, with their vicious propaganda. However, when we awaken, we act, and usually, effectively. I remember several years ago when a European country was engaging in propaganda in this country. We tolerated it for several years, and then became disgusted. An aroused public opinion asserted itself, in consequence of which the State Department acted. If it had not, a congressional committee would have been appointed to make an investigation. That kind of propoganda stopped.

Only a few years ago the committee of which I was chairman was appointed to investigate Nazi, communistic, and other un-American activities in this country. We obtained and gave to the American people such evidence that an aroused public opinion demanded that the efforts emanating from officials abroad cease. They have ceased.

For years we have listened to the prattle of these avowed haters of our country and its ideals, blasting the peace and quiet of our land with their advocacy of communism, by force and violence, as a panacea for all of our economic and social ills. We are getting sick and tired of it. It is about time that we passed legislation that will make these antisocial members of this movement respect the rights of American citizens. Its about time that we passed legislation making it a crime to knowingly and willfully advocate the overthrow of Government by force and violence. Such a bill is pending in the House of Representatives, having been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary. It is now before the Rules Committee. The Rules Committee should report a rule in order that this bill might be considered by the House. I have tried to obtain such a rule, but have not been successful to date. That bill will pass overwhelmingly if brought out on the floor. The people of the United States should demand of the Rules Committee that this bill be brought up in the House.

Legislation should also be passed this session providing for the deportation of alien Communists. Over 50 percent of the members of the Communist Party are aliens. They advocate the destruction of the Government, and at the same time claim its protection. They earn their living under the protection of the Government that they hate and would destroy. They are not entitled to any sympathy or consideration. Drastic legislation along such lines should be passed at once. The people of America should also demand of the Members of the Congress the immediate passage of such legislation. While this malignant theory can never find any substantial support among the liberty-loving people of our Nation, nevertheless we must work to eliminate the evil results which proceed from their doctrine of force and violence. I do not recognize the advocacy of force and violence as constituting freedom of speech. It is license. One might just as well argue that the offering of human sacrifice as a part of a religious belief constitutes freedom of religious conscience, as to argue that the right to advocate the overthrow of government by force and violence constitutes freedom of speech, or of the press.

I read a book recently, written by Earl Browder, secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, and who is the leader of the movement in this country, wherein he admitted that such conditions as would constitute a revolutionary situation do not exist in this country. Despite that fact, he urges his followers to direct their efforts toward effecting such a situation. That shows completely their insincerity, their duplicity, their hypocrisy, their antisocial state of mind. That shows their philosophy cannot stand up under the light of reason. That is why they appeal to the unfortunate who is distressed; to those who are discontented; to those who are emotionally moved. They are trying to use those who can be swayed through emotion to obtain their objective, after which every individual right and personal liberty will be destroyed. It is a sinister plot. They dare not resort to the constitutional method of obtaining changes. They have the opportunity under the Constitution to try to obtain their end. They can advocate communism if they want to, within the law, by appealing to the people to vote for candidates pledged to the changes they advocate. If they are successful in influencing the people and electing enough legislators, they can change the Constitution. That is the constitutional way. But they dare not employ the method created by the framers of the Constitution. By so doing they would have to appeal to reason. Lacking in the appeal to reason, they resort to the use of force and violence.

To again show their hypocrisy, and the insincerity of their position, the same author, in an attempt to defend the use of force and violence, very blissfully states that the Communist Party advocates such drastic action only when the existing government refuses peacefully to transfer to them control of its functions. He emphasizes the fact that force and violence are unavoidable in the United States, because the people of this Nation do not desire communism. Therefore, they must be forced to accept it. He admits that the Government cannot be made into a Soviet nation under the present constitutional processes which require the sanction of the people. Hence, the great majority of our people who are peace-loving citizens must endure the wild and irrational acts of a small anti-American, antisocial group.

Browder in his book What Is Communism? presents one of the best arguments against communism that I have ever read. In an attempt to further communism he exposes its hypocrisy—its weakness—he presents its true picture.

Of course, everyone knows that communism is opposed to every ideal that we stand for. It is opposed to the family life as it exists among religious people. It is opposed to religion in any form. It openly advocates the destruction of religion. It is opposed to religious freedom. It is opposed to freedom of speech and of the press. It is opposed to the right of trial by jury. It stands for the confiscation of property. It is opposed to personal liberty in every form.

Examine what he says with reference to religion. If there is one thing that Americans stand for, it is the right of religious freedom and of a free exercise thereof. Browder urges Communists to associate with religious groups, and to organize them under the guise of the united front. He states in no uncertain language that prospective Communists need not sever their religious affiliations before joining the movement, but after they join they will be subjected to a very rigorous educational process in which the author expects the novice to see as all Communists should that religion should be destroyed. He talks about liquidation if the objective should be attained. By liquidation he means what happened in Russia—the murder or imprisonment of all who do not agree. In his book he also boasts of certain ministers who are cooperating with them under the united front policy. He then scorns them. I wonder how those he had in mind feel after reading his book to realize that he boasts of their use and then scorns and condemns them for believing in God and a hereafter. If such men have any judgment at all they will at once withdraw from any united front alliances that they now have with the Communists. With them their efforts are to obtain the changes they advocate, and which they believe are for the best interests of the people, and to continue as ministers their work of God, as their religion dictates. That is not so with the Communists. With them their united front efforts with others are simply a means to an end, using others in any way that they can, and if successful, intending to suppress them as well as all others. How can they work with such men as Browder? Although I do not hold the same religious belief as these ministers, my respect for the freedom of religious worship urges me to warn them of the pitfalls to which their association with the Communists will inevitably lead. They are jeopardizing their own freedom of religious worship along with the freedom enjoyed by all others, by permitting these scoffers and enemies of all religions to masquerade under their banners.

What I have said also applies to a small but powerful group of professors. Browder admits that Communists owe no allegiance to the United States. He states that Communists will not serve in any conflict in which our country might be engaged. He attempts to justify such action by declaring that communism is opposed to all wars. However, he boasts of the allegiance of Communists to the Soviet Union, urging all to join with Russia if engaged in war in defense of the Soviet Union. In other words, Communists will not fight for the United States, but are willing to die in defense of Soviet Russia. His hypocrisy is exposed. This is a valuable lesson to real Americans who believe in peace and are doing all that they can to bring about permanent peace, but who will fight in the defense of our country not to become allied with Communists under another phase of the united-front policy of the Communists. I particularly refer to the League Against War and Fascism, a communistic organization, and to certain college students' organizations. They should have their own organizations. I am against war and I am opposed to fascism just as much as communism, but I am not joining any Communist organization in fighting isms and fascism. The name "League Against War and Fascism" is significant, showing its communistic origin and control. If it was otherwise, they would have designated the

organization as "the League Against War, Communism, and Fascism."

In his book Browder admits the Communist Party is committed to the policy of force and violence. He pleads guilty. There are no laws to impose punishment for such a crime against our Government. Such legislation should be passed.

The constitutional means exist in this country for any kind of a change that the people want. This movement is not content to proceed in the way provided by the Constitution. Its objective, if obtained, will result in the destruction of personal liberty. Personal liberty can only exist in a democracy. It cannot exist under a dictatorship. I call your attention to the countries of today wherein dictatorships exist. Personal liberty has been destroyed; persecution, fear, and force exist. The state is supreme. The individual has no rights. That is what communism stands for. It even goes farther than do most dictatorships in its destructiveness of human rights. It does not even tolerate the existence of religion in any form. It wars on religion and religious freedom, one of the great cornerstones of personal liberty.

Let the Communists renounce their advocacy of force and violence in trying to obtain their objective, a dictatorship of the proletariat, with its destruction of every ideal that America stands for. Let this movement advocate changes through the ballot box, and while I disagree with the objective sought, and will oppose their effort as it is my right, I will fight to preserve their constitutional rights. In doing this they will be acting within the Constitution and the law. However, I do not recognize the right of any movement to wilfully and deliberately advocate the overthrow of government by force and violence.

We have plenty of problems confronting us. Fortunately, we have the means of peacefully determining them. They will not be solved by a dictatorship of any kind, whether of communism, natzism, or fascism. I also call your attention to the new line of attack of the Communists and their allies. Anyone who attacks them or makes a speech along American lines, must expect to be called a Fascist.

The passage of legislation making it a crime to willfully and knowingly advocate the overthrow of government by force and violence, and the strengthening of the deportation laws relating to alien Communists will, from a legislative angle, meet their efforts. No American fears such legislation. Such legislation does not affect the right of anyone to advocate any change that they believe in, or want to, provided they do so within the law. Society is justified; in fact, it is its duty to protect itself and its law-abiding people against those who disregard the Constitution and the existing law.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LANE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REUSS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FASCELL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILLINGS and to include extraneous material.

Mr. FOGARTY.

Mr. BURDICK in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIDSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. UDALL.

Mr. METCALF in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. STAGGERS, and to include a speech delivered by the Speaker of the House of Representatives at the commencement exercises at the University of West Virginia.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. FASCELL) and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. DIGGS (at the request of Mr. MACHROWICZ) for June 20, 21, and 22, 1955, on account of official duties.

Mr. HESS (at the request of Mr. SCHERER) for June 21, 22, and 23, 1955, on account of his being away from Washington on official business of the Congress.

Mr. BELL (at the request of Mr. KILGORE) for this week on account of illness.

Mr. TOLLEFSON (at the request of Mr. PELLY) for June 20 to 22, 1955, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 847. An act to authorize the construction of two surveying ships for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 890. An act to strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1400. An act to protect the integrity of grade certificates under the United States Grain Standards Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1472. An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to desert-land entrymen to the same extent as such assistance is available to homestead entrymen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1550. An act authorizing the State Highway Commission of the State of Maine to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the St. Croix River between Calais, Maine, and St. Stephen, New Brunswick, Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 1757. An act to amend the act known as the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, approved August 14, 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1759. An act to consolidate the Hatch Act of 1887 and laws supplementary thereto relating to the appropriation of Federal funds for the support of agricultural experiment stations in the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1966. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing of documents evidencing the lease, mortgage, conditional sale, or bailment of motor vehicles sold to or owned by certain carriers subject to such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2097. An act to authorize the transfer to the Department of Agriculture, for agricultural purposes, of certain real property in St. Croix, Virgin Islands; to the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2098. An act to amend Public Law 83, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2237. An act to amend the act of May 26, 1949, to strengthen and improve the organization of the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution to modify the authorized project for Ferrells Bridge Reservoir, Tex., and to provide for the local cash contribution for the water supply feature of that reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 208. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas and Oklahoma, to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the appointment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States;

H. R. 2984. An act authorizing E. B. Reyna, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Los Ebanos, Tex.;

H. R. 3878. An act to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended, pertaining to emergency flood-control work;

H. R. 4426. An act to amend section 7 of the act approved September 22, 1922, as amended;

H. R. 4573. An act authorizing Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 5188. An act to prohibit publication by the Government of the United States of any prediction with respect to apple prices;

H. R. 5841. An act to repeal the fee stamp requirement in the Foreign Service and amend section 1728 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

H. R. 5842. An act to repeal a service charge of 10 cents per sheet of 100 words, for making out and authenticating copies of records in the Department of State;

H. R. 5860. An act to authorize certain officers and employees of the Department of State and the Foreign Service to carry firearms; and

H. R. 6410. An act to authorize the construction of a building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution, including the preparation of plans and specifications, and all other work incidental thereto.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution directing a study and report by the Secretary of Agriculture on burley tobacco marketing controls.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 16, 1955 present to the President, for his approval a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1. An act to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 21, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

905. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1956 in the amount of $35,200,000 for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (H. Doc. No. 190); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

906. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the fiscal year 1955 and proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1956 in the amount of $156,500,000 for the Post Office Department, and a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the fiscal year 1956 for the Federal Facilities Corporation (H. Doc. No. 191); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

907. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting a report on budget and accounting, pursuant to Public Law 108, 83d Congress (H. Doc. No. 192); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

908. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, relative to a proposed loan by the Department of the Navy to the American Museum of Natural History of one 56-foot LCC, hull No. 22667 for use by the Department of Micropaleontology of the museum, pursuant to section 1 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 897, as amended; 34 U. S. C. 546f); to the Committee on Armed Services.

909. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on the liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the quarter ended March 31, 1955, pursuant to the RFC Liquidation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

910. A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the court's order relative to the case of *Av-Equip Manufacturing Company* v. *The United States* (Congressional No. 3–53), pursuant to House Resolution 256, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

911. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

912. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

913. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of persons involved, pursuant to the act of Congress approved July 1, 1948 (Public Law 863), amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

914. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

915. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the general supply fund, General Services Administration, for the period from July 1, 1949, through June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 109 (e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (5 U. S. C. 630g (e)); to the Committee on Government Operations.

916. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting the report of its Subcommittee on Research Activities, pursuant to Public Law 108, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

917. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting the report of its Subcommittee on Transportation, pursuant to Public Law 108, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

918. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting the report of its Task Force on Food and Clothing, pursuant to Public Law 108, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

919. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting the report of its Task Force on Lending Agencies, pursuant to Public Law 108, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

920. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting the report of its Task Force on Surplus Property, pursuant to Public Law 108, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

921. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting the report of its Task Force on Legal Services and Procedure, pursuant to Public Law 108, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

922. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Wapinitia project, Juniper division, Oregon, pursuant to section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) (H. Doc. No. 193); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of June 16, 1955, the following bills were reported on June 18, 1955:

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 6040. A bill to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and to repeal obsolete provisions of the customs laws; with an amendment (Rept. No. 858). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5560. A bill to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 859). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5936. A bill to provide wage credits under title II of the Social Security Act for military service before July 1956, and to permit application for lump-sum benefits under such title to be made within 2 years after interment or reinterment in the case of servicemen dying overseas before July 1956; with an amendment (Rept. No. 860). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted June 20, 1955*]

Under clause 2 of rule XII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee of conference. H. R. 2126. A bill to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters (Rept. No. 861). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee of conference. H. R. 103. A bill to provide for the construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects by irrigation districts and other public agencies (Rept. No. 862). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 5168. A bill to provide for retirement of the Government capital in certain institutions operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration; to increase borrower participation in the management and control of the Federal Farm Credit System; and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 863). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLE: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4717. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to quitclaim all right, title, and interest of the United States to certain lands to the village of Sag Harbor, N. Y.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 864). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6829. A bill to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 865). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 204. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 203; with an amendment (Rept. No. 866). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PRICE: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Proposed agreements for cooperation between the Turkish Republic and the United States, the United States of Brazil and the United States and the Republic of Colombia and the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 867). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 6897. A bill to amend section 313 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to permit the substitution, for drawback purposes, of domestic crude petroleum for imported crude petroleum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 6898. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce retirement age

for women from 65 to 60, to provide old-age insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have not reached retirement age, and to provide child's insurance benefits for certain disabled children over the age of 18; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 6899. A bill to prohibit the charging of a fee to view telecasts in the home; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 6900. A bill to provide for the strengthening of the Reserve Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 6901. A bill to provide rewards for information concerning the illegal introduction into the United States, or the illegal manufacture or acquisition in the United States, of special nuclear material and atomic weapons; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 6902. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to reduce from 65 to 60 years the age at which wives and widows may qualify for old-age and survivors insurance benefits and to provide for the payment of disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H. R. 6903. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 6904. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Booker T. Washington National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

H. R. 6905. A bill to establish in the Executive Office of the President a National Freedom Board which shall direct the activities of the United States in promoting the cause of freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 6906. A bill relating to the computation of the invested capital credit for excess-profits-tax purposes in certain cases where property has been exchanged for stock and where the stock has been distributed as a taxable dividend; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 6907. A bill to enable the State of South Dakota to enter into a modification of its agreement under section 218 of the Social Security Act which will enable the cities of Aberdeen and Sioux Falls to obtain old-age and survivors insurance coverage for their policemen and firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 6908. A bill to amend section 1 (6) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, defining the term "airman"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRIEST (by request):

H. R. 6909. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to dispose of the remaining assets seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act prior to December 18, 1941; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. R. 6910. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, with respect to determination of sugar quotas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 6911. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional tax of $1.50 a proof gallon on neutral spirits used in blended whiskies or other beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 6912. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a partial tax credit for certain payments made to a public or private educational institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 6913. A bill to make it unlawful for the Federal Communications Commission to decide the question of pay TV against the expressed will and desire of the great American public; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 6914. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to modify, clarify, and provide additional authority for insurance of loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 6915. A bill to establish a National Library of Medicine; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 6916. A bill to assist the enforcement of State laws licensing insurance companies, by making it a Federal offense to use the mails to evade such laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ (by request):

H. R. 6917. A bill to provide that certain expenses of the Panama Canal Company and the Canal Zone Government shall be paid from tolls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 6918. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 6919. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which women may become entitled to benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6920. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a fully insured individual who becomes totally and permanently disabled shall be deemed to have reached retirement age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 6921. A bill to provide that the sale of narcotic drugs to a minor shall be a criminal offense punishable by death; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 6922. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. J. Res. 346. Joint resolution to supplement control of the budget; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. J. Res. 347. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on a Just and Lasting Peace; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. J. Res. 348. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to further extend certain charters of vessels to citizens of the Philippines and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. J. Res. 349. Joint resolution to establish an international university and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. J. Res. 350. Joint resolution providing for the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. CRETELLA: Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, concerning conversion of the Newington Veterans' Administration Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the Federal soil-conservation program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to H. R. 4927, amending the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to certain Mexican aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to directing attention to sound public policy with respect to division of taxing powers as between the Federal Government and the States and their subdivisions, and calling upon the Congress of the United States to institute appropriate action to reduce excessive Federal tax rates and limit the unrestricted taxing power of Congress in favor of the States and their subdivisions to the end that our form of government shall survive; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to highways, authorizing the issuance of $50 million in highway revenue bonds, and amending section 5260 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to waive certain restrictions with respect to exchanges of public lands for emergency relief to distressed persons in Puna, T. H.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 6923. A bill for the relief of certain Polish sailors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 6924. A bill for the relief of Joseph Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 6925. A bill for the relief of Connie R. Bly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 6926. A bill for the relief of Jessie Antoinette Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 6927. A bill providing for the conveyance to St. Louis Church of Dunseith, Dunseith, N. Dak., of certain lands on the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 6928. A bill for the relief of Christos Constantinou Liosis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 6929. A bill for the relief of Yvette Nedelec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 6930. A bill for the relief of Stirley Louis Berutich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 6931. A bill for the relief of William W. Kelly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 6932. A bill for the relief of Sui Shuen Tang, Una Wong Tang, James Tang, and Lily Tang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 6933. A bill for the relief of Jose Torres; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

320. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Oscar L. Chapman, Washington, D. C., relative to the Union Nacional de Productores de Azucar, S. A. de C. V., requesting an increased quota under the United States Sugar Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

321. Also, petition of the city and county clerk, Honolulu, T. H., relative to requesting the Congress of the United States to amend section 55 of the Organic Act to authorize and vest in the secretary of Hawaii the power and duty to reconstitute and reapportion the representation in the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii on the basis of population distribution within each of the electoral districts in the Territory; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Pan American World Airways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, a straightforward editorial of the Miami Herald, June 8, brings to mind the story of a great competitive enterprise, Pan American World Airways, which has contributed so much to aviation throughout the world.

Since 1927, Pan American has been operating with a Florida base. It was on an historic day in October of that year that Pan American flew from Key West to Habana—a distance of 80 miles—carrying passengers and United States mail. It was historic in that the flight marked the first time that a United States airline braved the uncertainties of scheduled overseas operations to indicate to the world that American aviation initiative was ready to take on all comers in this highly competitive field.

All of Pan American's competitors in the international field also have domestic operations. Across the Atlantic, across the Pacific, through Central and South America, the United States lines with which Pan American competes have extensive and profitable domestic routes.

Forty different air carriers operate in the Caribbean and Latin American fields. Eleven different carriers operate across the Atlantic, between the United States and Europe. Pan American is a private enterprise—owned not by a government but by more than 30,000 individual stockholders.

Pan American World Airways has been a leader in aviation because it has been a strong competitor.

Its effort to get into the thriving domestic business is in the American tradition, which has welcomed competition as a road to prosperity.

The editorial follows:

PAN AM WOULD CLOSE MIAMI-NEW YORK GAP

The highly important and strategic place of Miami in international aviation is highlighted in the hearings now under way before the Civil Aeronautics Board in Washington.

Pan American World Airways has made a bid to "bulwark air service between the most populous and fastest growing areas" in the country.

Should Pan American be granted the route, Miami and Florida would become the hub of a network liking Latin America, the United States and Europe for the first time by direct, one carrier route. The route between this city and Northeast United States is the busiest air trunk route in the country.

Oddly Pan American is able to fly around the world but not within its own country. The airline proposes to close the gap between its present gateway cities of Miami—to Latin America—and of New York—to Europe.

Pan American is not the only applicant. A dozen or more airlines are seeking either Boston or New York to Miami routes.

The local seers who confidently predict that greater Miami will have a population of more than 1 million by 1965 must be using the international airport as their crystal ball.

Bonded Canadians Take Jobs Away From New England Woodsmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address which I delivered over several stations in New England on Saturday, June 18, 1955, on the subject of "Bonded Canadians Take Jobs Away from New England Woodsmen".

This business of bringing in workers from outside the United States mainland—for employment on seasonal jobs, like the harvesting of crops—is a threat to the standards of our own people.

First came the Puerto Ricans. Then the Mexican wetbacks. And now, Canadian bonded lumberjacks to work in the woods of Maine and New Hampshire.

In the case of the Mexicans—they become "lost" in the United States, to the detriment of their own health and well-being; victims of unscrupulous employers who work them long hours on short pay.

Insofar as the Canadians are concerned, it is a situation where Americans are being crowded out of jobs in their own country by "visiting" woodsmen.

We do not blame the Canadians as much as we condemn those employers who put profit above any consideration for their fellow-Americans. We also deplore the attitude of Federal agencies that look the other way, whenever efforts are made to bring this subject to their attention.

We hear much these days about the need for promoting reciprocal trade.

But I have never heard of any proposal to permit foreign workers to come to the United States; evict American workers from their jobs; and then leave the country with their earnings.

Such a recommendation could never be supported—out in the open—except in case of war, when millions of men in the Armed Forces would create a civilian labor shortage.

These conditions do not exist now.

In fact, there are unemployed American woodsmen in New Hampshire and Maine.

Which leads us to believe that there may be a conspiracy to sidestep the laws.

The importation of Canadian bonded woodsmen has had the following harmful effects:

1. Numerous violations of wage and hour regulations.

2. Evasion of withholding tax payments with resulting loss of revenue to the United States Government. This places an extra burden on our own citizens who are already paying heavy taxes.

3. Reduction in the prevailing wage rates in the lumber industry, thereby placing American labor in a difficult position where it cannot compete with the cheap workers who come over the border.

Canadians will work for cheap wages. As long as they are going to be in the United States only a few months of each year, they are not interested in American standards. They will put up with food and lodgings that one of our workers would not tolerate.

Unfortunately, there is always the minority among employers in our country who do not understand that the equal status of labor at the collective-bargaining table is an accomplished fact. Under one pretext or another, they will try to shift progress into reverse gear.

The importation of bonded Canadian workers is one of these devices. When one company "gets away with it," other enterprises are tempted to try it.

First, they found an excuse to bring in cooks. Then came bulldozer operators, and choppers. Now they are hauling in heavy equipment, as if the United States were a backward nation that had never seen a chain saw, a crane, or a truck.

The "cheap-labor virus" is spreading. Garages, hotels, taxicab companies have been infected by it. Perhaps factories in the towns will catch the weakening fever that is coming out of the forest factories and import bonded Canadian workmen who will drive Americans out of their jobs.

If this infiltration, financed and encouraged by employers who are betraying the best American traditions, is permitted to increase, unchecked, then the northern parts of New Hampshire and Maine will become colonies of Canada.

I do not hold the Canadian Government responsible for this.

The operation was conceived, and is being carried out by certain employers who masquerade as United States citizens.

Aided and abetted by the amazing indifference of our own Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Office of Employment Security, United States Department of Labor.

Not to mention the Internal Revenue Department, which must be aware that income taxes are not being withheld from wages.

As of January 18, 1955, there were 5,000 of these Canadian woodsmen in the New England and the New York areas.

According to the Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Workers, American Federation of Labor, the advent of the bulldozer, the chain saw, the automobile, and mechanization in general, has changed wood operation considerably. Americans who left the woods are now anxious to go back. Americans are expert mechanics and are interested in conservation. Their roots are in the community. With good roads in and out of the woods, many of them are able to commute. They buy from the local merchants, and they pay taxes in the community. Of course, when they are compelled to remain in the woods, they require good camps and better food. The Canadians are understandably interested in going home to Canada with as much of their earnings as possible. They live in the woods during their entire stay (with occasional trips to neighboring cities or towns). They buy little or nothing in the community, and many of them do not pay their taxes.

As an official of the union has stated in part: "In the first place, it should always be borne in mind that the reason for bonded men being permitted to work in the United States of America was because of the war emergency in which we found ourselves short of certain skills. I refer specifically to the need for choppers in the woods, particularly in supplying pulp wood for our paper mills. We still recognize the fact that there is a limited need for choppers in this industry. However, with the unemployment problem as it now stands (in the North woods) the other skills can be very well supplied by American labor, and the Canadian bonded men should not, under any circumstances, be allowed to enter into competition with our own unemployed, either as to skills, or as to wage rates and working conditions. We cannot allow, nor will we permit the wage structure, which we have built up over the years through collective bargaining, to be depressed and chiseled away through the medium of competition for jobs by non-Americans, under any pretext whatsoever.

"We are now faced with the problem of garage owners and others applying for 'bonded men' to fill their alleged needs, ostensibly because there are no garage mechanics available, but actually because they do not want to pay the prevailing wage rate for garage mechanics. This condition could go on and on—store managers could ask for clerks on the pretext that no qualified labor was available for these trades. This situation could become more critical, and it is our intention to prevent it before it becomes too aggravated. * * * Manufacturers are protected by a tariff against the products of cheap labor from abroad. Our American workers should have some sort of protection, likewise, from the competition of bonded labor"—labor that is brought over the border and into our own backyard.

In case you might think this is a local, and isolated danger, let me remind you of the concern expressed by people living in the State of Iowa, which is not on any border, but is situated almost in the center of the United States. At the 1953 convention of the American Federation of Labor, the Iowa State Federation of Labor introduced a resolution objecting to the action taken by the United States Government in allowing the immigration of certain skilled nonagricultural workers. The Iowa Federation stated that these skilled workers were imported to work at substandard wages on jobs for which domestic workers were already available.

The Department of Labor has been alerted to the necessity of carefully checking all requests by employers to import workers, and of consulting with appropriate labor organizations in the United States, before approving any of these requests.

A hearing on the subject of Importation of Canadian Labor was held at the State house in Augusta, Maine, on February 28, 1955, presided over by Gov. Edmund S. Muskie.

One witness testified that: "The effect over the past 10 years following the war has been to set lumbering wage scales on a Canadian basis. The lower living costs and lower tax rates in Canada make work in Maine attractive indeed for the Canadian woodsmen. Glaring mismanagement of taxation allows bonded laborers to claim maximum dependency, and this circumvents our withholding taxes. Many persons with visas, so-called 'synthetic Americans,' have no intention of acquiring citizenship, but use this opportunity to collect employment insurance while residing in Canada. The understandable attitude of the Canadian, working in a foreign country, is one of exploitation. He works only for the weekly check to take home. He has no reason for loyalty to his employer; no particular respect for our laws or customs. He realizes he is tolerated only because of his ability to produce at the job. Usually accustomed to a somewhat lower living standard, he is content with living conditions which the average American would find intolerable."

Another stated that: "I would like to add this to what the boys have had to say. I have a crane which is not working at the present time. Why it is not is due to the fact that at the present time there are Canadian cranes in the Jackman (Maine) area, operating with jobbers. Where are the Americans? They are sitting with their cranes in the yard. They cannot work, due to the fact that they are hiring at lower prices than we can afford to work for."

Another described a Canadian outfit working in Maine: "They had a hovel, the horses in 1 end, a canvas in between, and 8 men living in that little place. All they had was logs on the floor, nothing but logs. Under these conditions Americans would not work. * * *"

In this brief broadcast I have just touched on some aspects of the problem.

I believe that there is enough prima facie evidence to warrant a thorough study of a situation that is closing the door to employment of Americans in their own country.

Because this is a problem that affects several States, and because it comes within the scope of certain Federal agencies, I think that the Congress should investigate the importation of Canadian bonded workmen.

Address by Hon. Barry M. Goldwater, of Arizona, at American Legion Convention at Tucson, Ariz.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I made last Friday before the American Legion Convention at Tucson, Ariz.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GOLDWATER BEFORE THE AMERICAN LEGION CONVENTION, TUCSON, ARIZ., ON FRIDAY, JUNE 17, 1955

Ever since he first walked on the face of the earth, man has been called upon to speculate on the future and his relationship with other men. War and the threat of war always seem to be an appalling prospect upon a never-ending succession of horizons. As each horizon and crisis was approached a new one would be disclosed. As each succeeding generation improved upon the military skills of his civilization, his defensive and offensive needs became more and more complex.

Then came Hiroshima. That was the day that man finally succeeded in his efforts of finding a way of wiping himself off the face of the earth; the day when he seemed to have reached what many believe to be the final horizon for human speculation.

This awesome weapon coupled with the modern long-range aircraft suddenly made time-honored and proven military concepts obsolete. Military planners and thinkers were stirred to their depths. Atomic and thermonuclear airpower became a force transcending geographical barriers.

Recently, on the floor of the Senate, I indicated that we as a people have never fully understood the complexities of modern war or this Nation's military responsibilities. Too often, and this is most unfortunate, the frightening experience of war and the means to prevent it have been for many of us a personal matter, an inconvenience, something only remotely connected with what was considered to be more pressing and personal domestic problems. That day has ceased to exist. We can no longer live in little worlds of our own.

Because power has become so important in modern international relationships it is necessary that we understand its complexion and composition. To avoid the war of the future, we must understand war.

For the past several months your Congress has been carefully evaluating the proposed military budget for the next fiscal year. All of you, I am sure, are aware of the magnitude of the amount of money that is involved. In its discussions and hearings your Congress has considered the requirements of each of the three services, not only in the light of how to insure the safety of this country against possible military aggression but also to make certain that our security will be achieved by the economic use of our resources: materiel and manpower.

Until recently our military forces could be and were designed and maintained in light of our geographical position. Our relatively isolated position on the face of this globe has always been in our favor and was a factor influencing American military thinking and planning. This isolation gave us time, and time in the past provided us with that element of security which spelled victory in our military ventures. Today, however, we can no longer afford the luxury of maintaining a position "just strong enough" in order to gain the time necessary to permit us to turn the spirit and capabilities of our people into actions in support of a war effort. With the advent of the thermonuclear air age it has now become necessary for us to have a force in being capable of forestalling or turning back any threat: a force that will determine the final outcome of a struggle the moment it begins. Mobilization drafts and sparring for time will be neither practical nor possible. If we understand this, we need have no fear of the future.

It is axiomatic that before we can arrive at a satisfactory solution to a problem, we must first understand what the problem is. In any modern day military planning it is essential that both our military planners and civilian population understand the nature of the threat.

Since the termination of World War II, the aggressive and evil designs of world communism have become increasingly evident. The past 10 years have been a visible expression of Marxist-Lenin teachings; communistic attempts to extend its influence over the free nations of the world have been alarmingly successful.

The military stature of the Soviets has shown a tremendous improvement. In the emergence of a truly productive aeronautical industry the Soviets have been most impressive. The Russians have developed an air force numerically second to none. Modern-type jet fighters and bombers are standard operating aircraft within the USSR. Even the satellite nations are expanding and modernizing their air fleets. Soviet and satellite aircraft developments not only represent a considerable technological gain for the Communists but have upset the timetable of our own military thinking. We seem to have consistently underestimated the ability of the Soviet Union to produce all types of weapons. For example, we thought they could not duplicate our B–29 in less than 6 or 7 years; the Soviets did it in 2 years. We believed they would have some difficulties in making a good copy of a jet engine. Production of a better one was launched in the Soviet Union in less than 1 year. Our best scientific analysts claimed the Reds would not develop an atomic bomb in less than 6 to 10 years. We all were dumfounded by a surprise Soviet nuclear explosion within 3 years after they first began developing the device. Most recently they have displayed supersonic day fighters in operational quantities, and all-weather fighters also in operational numbers. Most important, however, has been their development to the production stage of a long-range heavy bomber comparable to our B–52. Is it any wonder, therefore, that we have some cause for concern? Should we not then consider our military needs and structure in the light of these developments within the Soviet Union?

The margin of superiority that this Nation once held over the Communists has been narrowed and, in certain instances, has been equaled. Today the Red bloc possesses the capability of striking anywhere within the United States. There is little that we can do to prevent Soviet production of military weapons. There is no practical way to stop them from building intercontinental bombers. We can and should, however, maintain a force capable of dampening her visions of world domination. We can and must keep our guard up, for the best way to prevent a war is to be able to win it. If we falter in these efforts to hold and increase our lead then we throw away our best insurance for peace.

We have, therefore, a twofold issue before us: First, we have the problem of restraining the expansionistic desires of world communism; and, second, the all-important need of defeating Red forces should aggression be forced upon us. Since for us military power is peace power, I should like to devote consideration to the first of these tasks, namely, influencing the behavior of the Soviets in a manner satisfactory to our interests.

As I have already indicated, the extension or limitation of a nation's wills, inclinations, and desires are closely related to the military posture of that nation. Call it power diplomacy if you will, but it is, nevertheless, the fact of our times. I say this even with the full realization that superior military power is no all-embracing solution. Many factors, including spiritual and moral, are essential to the preservation of peace. Unfortunately, no reliable way—and I stress the word "reliable"—has yet been found to do away with the need for physical strength if one is to reach the minds of men such as found in the Kremlin. The futility of war can be demonstrated to these men only through a position of strength.

Many may wonder then as to whether it is necessary that we be armed to the teeth. The question also arises as to whether more money is required for our military budgets. To both of these questions my answer would be a categorical "no." It is not so much a question of making certain that more money should be provided for military expenditures. I believe that money will always be forthcoming. Rather, the issue is to make certain that the money is wisely spent and that we develop only those forces required and capable of fulfilling their required mission. This, today, more than ever before, must be understood if the money we do spend on military force is to give us a military organization tailored to fit future requirements.

We and our allies today face the full potential fury of an enemy in the early phases of any future war. Today modern aircraft and the weapons of mass destruction have telescoped both time and space. The composition, command, and structure of our military forces must be accomplished with this factor in mind.

Field Marshal Montgomery, Deputy NATO commander, vividly describes the war of the future in three phases. In the first phase he visualizes a worldwide struggle for mastery in the air. The second phase will be concerned with the destruction of enemy land forces, while the third or bargaining phase will be the period when the enemy's homeland and all it contains will be at the mercy of airpower. Both in his thinking and the thinking of the NATO staff, the dominant factor in a future war will be airpower. Field Marshal Montgomery cautions us, however, that like in so many things we do and say, we too often only pay lip service to this great truth. Too often many military thinkers, both civilian and military, accept airpower as the key weapons system but fail to apply this thinking to our military planning. Even in the NATO organization, representation of allied air forces is inadequate. It seems to me that too few air force officers are in command or policy positions in this defense organization.

Operating in the medium of space, unrestricted by the definitive boundaries of land or sea, air forces are inherently capable of operating anywhere and at any time. This potential exposes the entire structure of other nations—both the material and social components—to the influence of air operations.

The proper employment of air forces requires recognition of their versatility as a component of the military instrument of national policy.

Adherence to these principles will provide the maximum return for our investment, disregarding them involves a high degree of risk and possible defeat.

The medium in which air forces operate—space—is an indivisible field of activity. This medium, in combination with the characteristics of air vehicles, invests air forces with the great flexibility that is the basis of their strength. For this flexibility to be exploited fully, the air forces must be responsive at all levels of operation to employment as a single, aggregate instrument.

All command arrangements must be in accord with the precept that neither air forces nor their field of activity can be segmented and partitioned among different interests. Because air forces possess the inherent ability to concentrate effort at decisive times and places, they can be employed in a variety of tasks for the purpose of accomplishing a variety of effects. They can perform the tasks simultaneously or in rapid sequence, with all supporting a common objective. However, the versatility that makes this wide variety of employment possible has also led to demands on our Air Force of a divisive nature. The segmenting of our airpower potential and the diffusion of its effort in unrelated or secondary tasks is an infeasible and an excessively costly undertaking. The full advantages of flexibility of our airpower is being lost, the unity and integrity of our Air Force is being destroyed, and its strength has been dissipated in a piecemeal effort.

It is inconceivable to me that much of our military thinking still remains largely tied to surface strategies and looks at airpower in the light of a supporting force. Military concepts, and thus military budgets, are unnecessarily restricted by tradition. These prejudices of history must be overcome if the contribution of our airpower to national policy is to be decisive.

In the past the primary medium of power of a maritime nation was seapower. Within the past few years airpower has replaced seapower as the key to national strategy. Since it is a key, it must be the dominant force.

American airpower can and does vitally affect our relationships with the Soviet Union. Its effectiveness as an instrument of national policy must not be hampered either by parceling out its elements or by assigning to it tasks that do not contribute to securing or maintaining worldwide air domination.

Airpower has given us a new meaning for such principles of war as "economy, flexibility, security, surprise, and control." The factors that influenced the course of previous conflicts have become meaningless since the nature of the medium of space gives to the air force a versatility never known to service forces. I certainly do not suggest that we do away with surface forces merely because we are in a nuclear air age. It is incredible to me, though, that many still consider the military budget to be a pie that should be cut into three equal or near equal slices. This competition for a part of the tax dollar is bad enough but where such competition compromises our national security the result may well be disastrous.

It is my opinion that the problem here is simply one of a definition of the meaning of airpower. The tendency exists to paraphrase our historical definition of seapower to the extent that many consider airpower as the sum of military aviation—Air Force, Army, Navy, and Marine—civil aviation, civil air transport, the aircraft industry, and the aeronautical skills of the country. In other words, many hold that airpower comprises the entire portion of the national effort that expresses itself in aircraft, aircrews, and operational facilities. This is not airpower; it is air potential. Such a definition is inaccurate in that it omits the principal ingredient, namely, unity of command.

Far too many have failed to emphasize this element of unity which must be inherent in airpower. Today the administrative compartmentation of our Air Forces is creating an organization that is neither fish nor fowl. Too much thinking is in terms of either offensive atomic airpower, or air-defense measures, or tactical land support operations, or theater air operations, etc. To complicate matters, we have four Air Forces each busily engaged in or vying with each other to perform each of these tasks. Instead, we should be concerned with the unification of our entire airpower potential into a single force—an Air Force in being that can go anywhere to do what is necessary.

We have worked ourselves into the position of being so concerned with achieving a mechanical balance of force that we have ended up with an unbalanced offensive-defensive structure. Instead of balance we must be concerned with the establishment of a military force in harmony with our defense requirements.

Over the North Pole from Arctic bases of the Soviet Union, the Red Air Force has a massive bomber air fleet capable of striking at us with nuclear weapons. The defense against this attack and our ability to retaliate is completely dependent upon the power of our Air Force. If we lose the first phase, which is the struggle for mastery in the air, in this war of the future, the outcome of the last two phases as defined by Field Marshal Montgomery will not be in doubt—for the Soviet Union.

Just as in the days past, seapower was the strategy whereby nations were controlled and was the measure of the strength of nations, so too in this modern day is the strategy of airpower the only logical and genuinely acceptable avenue of approach to the problem of creating and maintaining world peace.

Russia does not have to rely on the ocean for her lines of communication and supply. Russia is essentially self-sufficient, and even the satellites that now come under her vicious wings are approached by land or, more important, they are now easily approachable by air. Hence the real power of ocean offensive—blockade and strangulation—will not affect Russia's ability to exist during war, or even to wage to a successful conclusion. On the other hand, her submarines can roam the seas, where we used to feel safe, and apply the same strategy against us which we would apply against her were seapower a factor in our retaliation potential.

By an emphasis on airpower, we utilize our technological advantages, we lean upon our great productive ability, we exploit the basic weakness of the enemy, which is now interior communication, and we do so with a minimum of manpower and a considerably reduced burden upon the economy of our country. This latter consideration is of especial importance, for the proponents of Bolshevik communism have often stated that they will destroy the Western Powers from within by destroying their economic systems; and, if we continue the policy based on the illusion that the unlimited use of money will strengthen us, then we give concrete impetus to their mode of destruction. No economy, including that of the United States, can stand forever the pressures of maintaining full war production and full war manpower in periods of peace. We can, however, look carefully at our hole card, and then proceed in an intelligent and forceful manner to strengthen it.

Address by Senator Thye at Rice County Farmers Union Picnic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address which I delivered yesterday at Faribault, Minn.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD J. THYE, OF MINNESOTA, AT RICE COUNTY FARMERS UNION PICNIC, ON JUNE 19, 1955

I am delighted to be back in Minnesota and Rice County, and to be with you in this beautiful Alexander-Faribault Park. I have lived as a neighbor to Rice County and Faribault most of my adult life.

As you know, my farm home is just a mile from the Rice County line in Dakota County. Many of you are my neighbors. Some I have served with and have been associated with in farm and community activities over the years.

Serving you in the United States Senate, I am happy to be able to report to you that the affairs of our Nation are in good condition in almost all categories of our economy, agriculture being the weakest phase of our national economy. I will dwell more fully on this later.

Under the dynamic leadership of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles, we have seen great strides in the past year toward the hope, prayer, and objective of all freedom-loving people—the hope for permanent peace.

We have seen Austria regain its independence. We have noted that men from the Kremlin have gone to Yugoslavia to confer, instead of demanding and threatening, as they have done in the past.

We have seen the economic conditions of the countries of Western Europe improve month by month, thereby lessening the opportunities for the Communists in that area. That is the reason why Russia is today showing the conciliatory attitude it is, and opening its Iron Curtain to permit the free people to have an occasional glimpse beyond its borders.

The strength of the United States and her allies is such that the Soviet leaders know that what they prophesied—a depression and the failure of our free-enterprise system after the end of the Korean conflict—has not come to pass.

Russia had planned and laid all its strategies on the chaos such a depression would bring in the United States, but we are not in a depression.

The United States has the greatest economic strength ever in its peacetime history. The Communists had planned an infiltration into all of the countries of the world, expecting that when the depression hit there would be widespread unemployment.

It was the plan of the Russians to then take control of the different governments by getting a percentage of their people into the administrative as well as the legislative bodies of the governments.

Thus the Russian predictions and plans have failed. By strengthening the economy of countries of Western Europe and creating military strength through the Atlantic pact nations, we have destroyed Communist opportunities to work freely in the countries there. Western Germany, having become a free nation, in alining its economic as well as its future military strength with the free nations, has brought about a complete change in the tactics of the Russian leaders. Now they are endeavoring to negotiate and create friends and allies rather than to threaten nations with force.

We are rapidly gaining diplomatic control of the problems in the Pacific. But a few months ago we were threatened with what seemed to be an open conflict in the Formosa Straits. Pray God that we may continue to win, diplomatically.

We have noted a splendid reconstruction in the South Korean area and building of a good army by Syngman Rhee in Korea.

We have many problems in the Vietnam area. I was in the Hanoi region of North Vietnam, as well as other such areas, in 1953.

As precarious as the situation is in Indochina, more especially in the Veitnam area, I am confident that the patience and diplomatic understanding of President Eisenhower will lead us to a solution of the problem that will aid us in bringing to the Pacific area the opportunity for permanent peace.

Japan is confronted with an economic problem in the rebirth of its industrial activities, based upon a civilian rather than a military economy that was shattered at the conclusion of World War II. Japan has always traded with the mainland of China, and since Japan must have an industrial economy, in order to survive she must have a method of acquiring raw materials and an export market. That market must be either mainland China or the United States and Western Europe.

These are all diplomatic problems not easily resolved. I am confident that we in the United States are moving effectively in the right direction. As a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate I have participated in many long weeks of public and executive hearings. We have been getting information on all manner of millitary development, not only concerned with air strength but also in the atomic field—guided missiles, and so forth—and I know the dangers that would beset civilization if ever atomic warfare were set loose in a world-wide conflict.

Because everything possible must be done to maintain peace, I have done all in my power to assist in bringing about a rebirth of the economy of the nations of Western Europe, and to bring a technical assistance program to countries such as Korea and India, and to Pakistan, to help these people produce food and fiber to feed and clothe their people.

It is far cheaper to spend a few million dollars in this field than it is to spend the possible hundreds of billions for war preparations. Now, again, referring to the farm economy—What is wrong?

Why is our farm economy so weak? We have the greatest purchasing power, for food products, ever available in this Nation. Our businesses are at an extremely high and profitable level. We have the highest number of people employed that we have ever had. Wages are good and they are on the increase, as evidenced by recently negotiated wage contracts. However, farm prices are on the decline. Why are they?

Under normal conditions, present prosperity should mean good prices for the farmer. Let's examine the record. We have seen the net income of the farmer drop from nearly $17 billion down to $11.4 billion annually. We have seen the farmers' percentage of the consumers' dollar, the dollar spent for food, drop from 54 percent in the mid-forties down to 42 percent in April of this year. It is still on the downward trend and might well go to 41 percent. We have seen agricultural parity ratios drop from 115 percent of parity to 87 percent of parity. It is going lower.

The Secretary of Agriculture has just announced a drop to 76 percent in the parity price support on wheat for the coming year. Why? Why has the agricultural economy dropped in this drastic manner when our entire national economy has been expanding? I believe the attacks upon the farm support program, the denunciations of the farm support program, have brought about a fear psychology in our agricultural economy, which has depressed the farm economy more than any effect our surpluses should have had upon our markets. We need to reinstill confidence in our agricultural economy.

This fear psychology, as it weakens agricultural prices, has frightened the businessman out of the produce and commodity markets. They have not dared endeavor to revive our export markets. This fear psychology, as it has weakened the market, has caused a lowering of prices and the Commodity Credit Corporation has lost huge sums of money on its inventories. No one would deny the right of every phase of our economy to parity. In all my public service, whether it was in the Governor's office here in the State, or on a national level as your Senator, I have endeavored to maintain all segments of our national economy at parity, whether it be the Federal worker, laboring man, investor or farmer. I have endeavored at all times to maintain stability in our national economy.

We in the United States need to put forth all the ingenuity of our economists and business experts in our endeavors to resolve the problems of agriculture. If we cease to denounce the farm-support program, if we look upon it as the foundation under our produce and commodity prices, we can

give a rebirth to the true American confidence in our agricultural economy and reestablish and stabilize that economy.

Surpluses of food and fiber are a blessing we should always be thankful for, and we should not permit them to become an issue to be debated on every political platform.

Acceptance of Honorary Membership in Massachusetts Department of Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the partial remarks I delivered in accepting the honorary membership in the Massachusetts Department of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., at the convention banquet, held in Fall River, Mass., on Sunday, June 19, 1955:

I deeply appreciate your thoughtfulness and your hospitality.

It came as a very pleasant surprise when I was notified that you had considered me as being worthy of honorary membership in your fine organization of veterans.

In the 14 years during which I have served in the Congress of the United States it has been my sincere endeavor to work for legislation beneficial to the 20 million men and women who have loved our country even above life itself.

To dignify the memory of those who did not come back.

To protect their widows and orphans.

To care for those in veterans hospitals.

And to perpetuate those American principles to which your organization is devoted.

It was a happy circumstance for me that I was born and brought up in the city of Lawrence, where Irish and Italian neighbors predominate.

Our two peoples are very close together in their mutual reverence for God and their passionate faith in freedom of opportunity for all men.

While our parents worked hard in factory and in home to open the way to a better life for us, we learned the lessons of American partnership.

On the empty lots where we played baseball and football, and through the years of our schooling where we developed the courage, the skill, and the friendships that make faith in freedom so strong, we created a new relationship.

The brotherhood of American citizenship.

The vital, alternating current that passes from one to another, and back again, building respect, and confidence, and fellowship.

This is the reason why our Nation is great; a reason so simple and true that tyrants can never understand it.

The people of the United States generate a human power that produces abundance in time of peace, and fighting men of unsurpassed morale in time of danger.

No king, or dictator, or palace guard could ever order the advances we are making.

Because we are doing it on our own, as human beings who believe that the making of a man is the first and foremost production of all, releasing those talents in each that enrich the whole American scene.

The number of automobiles that can be observed on every thoroughfare in the Nation—Sunset Boulevard to Scollay Square—or the list of mechanical servants in every home is not the real measure of our progress.

We do not value friends by their credit rating.

Ours is the growing nation where the extremes of poverty and wealth are being absorbed into the general prosperity that promotes good will.

Our fathers and mothers worked long and hard, cheered by the certainty of a better future for their children.

When Mrs. Clancy was sick abed and Mrs. Deluca brought over some hot food for the children, a strangeness disappeared.

And when Mr. Pappalardo approached Mr. Sullivan, hat in hand, to ask for a job on the construction crew, Mr. Sullivan said: "Put your hat on and go to work and never forget that all men are equals here," a comradeship began that brought happiness to both.

Culminated when the daughter of one and the son of the other were married a few years later.

That is what we mean by the human power of trust and affection as people learn to understand and appreciate each other in freedom.

I remember the Verdi Band on the common; the fiestas.

The hospitality and the joy of living that made one feel right at home among friends of Italian descent.

That was many, formative years ago.

Today I feel that warmth of welcome—on a larger scale—as I am adopted for honorary membership in the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States.

I humbly hope that I may be a credit to the family—living up to the patriotic ideals exemplified by my comrades in the department of Massachusetts.

For as we adopt one another—strengthening the ties of the larger American family—we are building a human power that will surely triumph over every evil and every danger that may threaten our unity.

Together we shall go on building a better America, day by day and in every way.

In liberty, equality, and fraternity.

Design for the New Air Force Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, my office has received a number of protests concerning the design of the new Air Academy as made public by the Air Force several weeks ago. Investigation of the situation leads me to bring this matter before the House. Unless Congress calls a halt to the present plans of the executive department, it would appear that the Secretary of Air and the Air Force are about to make a serious mistake, one with which we would have to live for many years.

Establishment of a national Air Academy as the Air Force counterpart of West Point and Annapolis was the life-long dream of the late Gen. Billy Mitchell. This dream moved close to reality last year when Congress authorized an expenditure of $126 million for this purpose. Subsequently, the Air Force appointed as Air Academy architects a Chicago architectural firm which designed the Lever Brothers glass building in New York and a number of industrial structures throughout the country. The firm, Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, was appointed to design the Air Academy, coordinate the engineering services, and supervise construction. On May 14, models of the design were unveiled at Colorado Springs, Colo., the site of the new Academy.

What was seen by the congressional observers and the press caused considerable consternation. A spontaneous protest by churchmen throughout the Nation caused the Air Force to withdraw almost immediately the design for the chapel. This glass-and-metal creation was described variously as an accordion lying on its side and a line of telescoped Indian tepees. Outside this tin building, hanging from a metal rack in the fashion of the ice cream wagon we see in summer, were the church bells. The whole business sat on a terrace which one architect said was Egyptian and another said originated with the Incas.

The balance of the plan has not been altered, we are told. The overall plan consists of a number of glass, aluminum, and steel buildings on stilts. When he first saw the design, Representative HARDY, of Virginia, commented that it looked like a cigarette factory. Congressman HARDY proved to be something of a prophet, because only a few days later, Frank Lloyd Wright, the famous architect, declared flatly that the Air Academy design is a violation of nature. He predicted that the Air Academy, if built as planned, would become known—not as the national shrine it should and must be—but as Talbott's aviary and a factory for birdmen. Mr. Wright said in a letter which was published in the Colorado Springs Free Press of May 27:

The Air Force Academy looks to me as if another factory had moved in where it ought not to be.

Since that time, there seems to have been considerable confusion. According to the Air Force's Public Relations Department, work on the Air Academy is to begin this summer. Yet, Secretary of Air Talbott has been quoted in the press as saying the design is not yet in its final form.

My purpose in discussing this subject today is to urge its revision—in its entirety—for two basic and most important reasons. They are quite simple: First, the design is not American in conception and is unworthy of the tradition of this Nation; second, the taxpayers should not be saddled with an initial cost of $126 million for construction of the Academy and its supporting facilities, and heaven knows how much more for maintenance over the years, to build a monument to experimental materials.

Let us take these points one at a time.

The Air Academy should be a national shrine, as are the historic buildings of West Point, and the Naval Academy in Annapolis. Like its Army and Navy counterparts, the Air Academy should reflect our Nation's origins, its culture, represent its teachings, and symbolize its humanity. It should have warmth, and

beauty, and an atmosphere of American history. The Air Force has stated publicly that, besides teaching our future airmen mechanical skills, its duty is to inculcate unimpeachable character, an unflagging sense of duty, and devotion to the best interest of the Nation.

Instead, we have a design and choice of materials reminiscent of a cafeteria. A knowledge of architecture is unnecessary in sensing the faults of this plan. It is difficult to find any trace of American heritage in the cold, impersonal, and mechanical appearance of these buildings. Several leading architects who studied the drawings and photographs of the models made several interesting observations. What they said can be compressed into two sentences. The design is not American. It is based on a hodgepodge of European and Near Eastern influences, and not even the best of those. When you examine the models, you find the Egyptian or Near Eastern terraces. The senseless elevation of everything on stilts, I am told, was popular in Europe—particularly in Germany—during the 1920's, but has since been discarded as outmoded.

The cold surfaces and lack of decoration follow the fad we have seen expressed principally in New York City. Last April, Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, commenting on so-called modern architecture, described the United Nations Building and the new glass and metal buildings on Park Avenue as—and I quote—"illuminated cracker boxes or elongated shoeboxes on stilts." One of the Air Academy designers stated in unveiling the models that his was a timeless design and will be good 100 years from now. He is a brave man, and a wise one, too, to look so far into the future and tell us what it holds.

I wonder if some of our so-called modern architects, back in the days of the Civil War, were not saying the same sort of thing about the jigsaw architecture which became a craze for a brief span. You may remember the jigsaw architecture—the odd-looking cutouts and scrolls of wood that cluttered up every building that was erected for a time. Today, the buildings which were victims of that architectural aberration are archaic curiosities.

Architectural styles are variable and fickle. Yet West Point and Annapolis are as in keeping with American tradition today as the day they were built. It is significant, too, that each of these great service Academies has found it desirable to tell its history—and the history of the United States—through statuary, busts of its heroes, murals, portraits, and other objects of art. Presumably, the Air Force has the same goals—to immortalize its pioneers, its leaders, and its generations of fighting men. It would seem strange, indeed, if the Air Force has not planned artistic representations of the history of aviation, murals depicting our great aerial victories, statues of Gen. Billy Mitchell, and our other heroes of the air. This is visual education. Thus is taught reverence for service and country. But how do you execute a mural on a glass wall? Where do you hang the portraits? Is there any place for tradition and a narration of the history of America amid glass walls and aluminum panels? I think not.

Now we come to the second point. The choice of materials. Glass and metal, of course, are alien to American monumental design—even to European. This is so obvious it needs no further comment. Let us then concern ourselves with the compatibility of the materials with their demands from the standpoint of structure and environment. The Weather Bureau reports that temperatures in Colorado Springs area range from 27 below zero in February to 97 above in June and July. There is intense sunlight. Yet the Academy instruction building has glass walls, floor to ceiling. Any engineer can provide information on the heating and air-conditioning problems of glass buildings. The problem is difficult; the costs, enormous. I understand the glass walls of the Air Academy buildings are to be tinted to reduce some of the glare. There seems little or no justification for this. There is an interesting—not to say fantastic—rationalization of it.

I will read one sentence from the current issue of the magazine, Architectural Forum. Commenting upon the glass walls and their effect on the airmen, the Forum states:

> Some days they will squint, but the basic Air Force expression is a cowboy squint, shrewd and appraising.

It is a fascinating rationalization—to make a virtue out of a structural fault which makes you squint to protect your vision.

Let us consider another factor. An 8-inch brick wall will easily withstand a 4-hour fire test during which the temperature applied rises to 2,300 degrees. Actually, many fire clays will resist up to 3,000 degrees. This 4-hour fire rating is mandatory in many parts of the country. Glass, on the other hand, provides little or no fire protection. It shatters easily under lateral force, pressure, and/or heat. Aluminum, of which a generous amount is contemplated in the Air Academy, melts at 1,200 degrees. This temperature is reached in less than 10 minutes of the fire-rating test. These fire test specifications are established by the American Society for Testing Materials.

Now let us come back to the aluminum panels recommended for exterior wall use on several Air Academy buildings. I have a letter written by the Sibbald Mason Constructing Co. to the Structural Clay Products Institute. The contractor, discussing the aluminum and steel construction of the new Statler Hotel in Hartford, Conn., has this to say—and I quote—

> I have observed and been informed by the architect and the vice president of the Statler chain of an existing condition that has caused considerable anxiety due to several facts as, namely, (1) it is difficult to hold caulking in place to stop leakage as vibration from wind is severe. (2) Shrinkage in aluminum on an 80-foot span is 1 inch. (3) Discoloration varies in panels in less than 1 year. (4) Dirt seems to be more noticeable on aluminum panel than on the white Hanley brick used on same building.

This information hints at the maintenance problems and costs which the Nation's taxpayers would face with the Air Academy. It would be interesting to have maintenance figures on the United Nations building in New York. The United Nations building is metal and glass. It is said in building circles that the building leaks like a sieve and repairs are constantly in progress. I have been told that approximately $360,000 was spent on repairs little more than a year following completion of the United Nations building. And, while we are discussing maintenance, let us give a thought to the Lever Bros. building. This is particularly interesting since the architects who designed it are the ones who originated this concept of the Air Academy. I have been told that the Lever building had to have special scaffolding equipment installed on its roof at a cost of $250,000. The purpose of this equipment was to allow continual washing of the building exterior with the Lever Bros. products—soap. I am told further that the building owners were required by insurance costs and the risks involved to hire scaffoldmen rather than ordinary window washers for the continual scrubbing of the glass walls.

It must be remembered that glass, like metal, requires constant cleaning, else it quickly takes on a dirty, unpleasant appearance. This is not true of brick, stone, granite, or any form of masonry. Masonry grows more beautiful with age. Architects say it would detract from the beauty of the Washington Monument to clean its stone sides. Recently, the National Press Building here in Washington had its first cleaning in 28 years. The renovation process, according to the newspaper stories, cost less than $10,000. So here you have it—$250,000 just to install the scaffolding equipment on the Lever Bros. building—$10,000 for a once-in-28-years cleaning job on the Press Building.

There is still another factor—that of cost. It is true that in monumental building the question of construction cost can be considered secondary. However, this should only apply, it seems to me, when it has been established that the building material in question is the finest, most suitable, and the most beautiful available. Since we have disposed of the question of beauty and suitability, let us, then, see if there is any argument to be made in behalf of these experimental materials on the basis of cost. You may remember an article which appeared in Life magazine last year in which it was alleged that the metal walls of a new building at Park Avenue between 49th and 50th Streets in New York City, were actually built in 1 day. Actually, one of the Nation's top contractors, John A. Mulligan, established that a crew of 20 men spent 5 months getting ready for that 1 day of slapping metal panels on the building.

And at least a week before the 1-day publicity stunt, all construction trades were laid off while special crews set all the panels in the proper positions for the blitz installation. This 22-story building was constructed with two walls of metal and two of glazed brick. Mr. Mulligan states, in a letter addressed to

President Harry C. Bates, of the Bricklayers Union, that all the masonry in the building, including labor and materials—and the masonry backing for the metal panels—cost less than $250,000. The metal walls cost more than $1 million.

In last January's issue of Architectural Form, there was an article on New York's new Socony-Vacuum building, a 42-story structure. I will quote but two paragraphs from the story. They state: "And what about the added cost?" asked Harrison and Horr, the architect and builder. Would not a stainless-steel skin cost half again as much as brick? But the steel industry wanted the building, and cost was not going to prevent them from getting it. To meet the competition, they were willing to write off any price differential as the cost of promoting steel. Result: New York's biggest skyscraper in 25 years will have a stainless steel skin. I will cite one other example—the Pennsylvania State Office Building in Pittsburgh's Golden Triangle.

Here, aluminum was selected as the exterior facing material. There were built 12-inch walls, 6 inches of aluminum, and 6 inches of block backup. For purposes of comparison, let us take a 10-inch cavity wall of brick and tile. This would provide a thinner wall and create more interior room. Now the 12-inch metal walls of the Pennsylvania State office building will pass a 2-hour fire test. The 10-inch brick-and-tile wall mentioned will pass a 4-hour fire test. The square-foot cost of the aluminum wall built in this Golden Triangle building was $6.73. This is a square-foot cost—in place. The square-foot cost of the brick-and-tile wall, using a glazed-face brick, is $4.31 in place, a saving of $2.42 per square foot. The time consumed in construction is the same for both materials—6 to 12 months—assuming, of course, that delivery of the metal is prompt.

I mention this because of the amusement created in building circles by the new Colgate-Palmolive-Peet Co. Building in New York. There a wall of glazed brick was built between January 28, 1955, and May 11. The adjacent metal walls were started November 12, 1954. The last I heard, the date of completion was set for some time in June.

I have singled out these few examples to make the point that purely from the structural standpoint, these materials have not proved themselves. They are experimental. This is not to say that all metal buildings are bad. Many of them may be good. But the overall question of worth must be decided many years hence. For they have not yet withstood the test of time. It is significant that in the Roman Coliseum, there are bricks and stone standing today in their original positions. The bricks are 1 inch thick and 24 inches long. They are relatively unwarped and in good condition after 2,200 years of exposure.

Today we see modern applications of these materials. In San Francisco, the new Equitable Life Insurance Building exterior is Vermont marble veneer. The Prudential Life Insurance Building, Chicago's biggest skyscraper, is limestone backed by brick. In New York, I am told, there is to be built a $20 million office building at Fifth Avenue and 53d Street whose walls will be fashioned of stone. Interestingly enough, the investment group which is paying for the building has switched from metal to masonry in planning this large project.

I have attempted here to cover some of the very important points involved in the design and construction of our National Air Academy. It is my understanding that a conference on the design has been set for June 20 at Colorado Springs. At that time, I hope, earnest thought will be given to a thorough reconsideration of the plans which have been formulated thus far. American art and architecture moved a great stride forward under the urging of a capable architect who became President of the United States. Let us follow the urging of Thomas Jefferson—to challenge the world in our building as we have challenged the world in our Constitution.

The Flag-Day Program in House Sets UNESCO Program Back on Its Heels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the UNESCO, a branch of the United Nations, got a well-deserved setback in the House of Representatives on Flag Day, June 14.

It will be remembered that UNESCO means "United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization." Its principal work so far has been to try to destroy loyalty and devotion to the United States and patriotism for our country on the theory that such feelings interfere with world government, and that therefore all national devotion, loyalty and patriotism should be destroyed in all countries and the sentiment transferred to world government.

In the House of Representatives the Flag-Day program was carried out with beautiful ceremonies, as the following program will suggest:

FLAG DAY PROGRAM, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JUNE 14, 1955

1. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 9, the Speaker declares a recess.

2. United States Air Force Band (Capt. Robert L. Landers, commanding) enters door to left of Speaker and takes position in aisle to left of Speaker.

3. Doorkeeper announces "The Flag of the United States."

Members rise.

Air Force Band plays The Stars and Stripes Forever.

The flag is carried into the Chamber by Air Force colorbearer and a guard from each of the other branches of the Armed Forces (Maj. Robert L. Eaton, U. S. A., commanding).

The color guard salutes the Speaker, faces about, and salutes the House.

4. Mr. RABAUT is recognized.

5. The Official Air Force Choral Group (The Singing Sergeants), accompanied by the Air Force Band, sing the new song, The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, by Irving Caesar, ASCAP. Soloist, M. Sgt. Ivan Genuchi.

6. Mr. RABAUT is recognized.

7. Members rise and sing The National Anthem, accompanied by the Air Force Band and The Singing Sergeants.

8. Members remain standing while the Colors are retired from the Chamber, the Air Force Band playing The Stars and Stripes Forever.

9. The Air Force Band leaves the Chamber.

The applause was spontaneous and prolonged, and left no doubt that in the great legislative Chamber of the United States loyalty and devotion to our own institutions and our love of our country remains resplendent and vigorous in spite of all attacks by this sinister organization, UNESCO.

Just as long as the House of Representatives of this great Republic is composed of Members like those who today enthusiastically expressed an undivided loyalty to our own Government the people can feel that the world government being engineered by the United Nations has a rough and rugged road to travel before the citizens of the United States are willing to abandon their own form of government.

National Wildlife Refuges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, sports columnist Bill Leetch of the Washington Star has called attention to bills, among them H. R. 2142 by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON], to require that not less than 40 percent of the money raised by sale of duck stamps be used for the purpose for which it was intended—acquisition of land for migratory bird rearing and feeding areas.

As Mr. Leetch says, passage of this bill would put an end to diversion of duck-stamp funds away from acquisition and to maintenance and other administrative expenses.

Here is that part of Mr. Leetch's column in last night's Star which refers to this bill:

Duck hunters would do well to obtain a copy of the speech of Representative LESTER JOHNSON of Wisconsin on May 27, entitled "We Have Found What Is Happening to Your Duck-Stamp Money, Mr. Duck Hunter." It is most revealing, and we wish we had space to print all of it. The trouble seems to be that an economy-minded Congress, abetted by the Budget Bureau, has so crippled the appropriations for Fish and Wildlife Service that it in turn has been forced to dip into duck-stamp funds in order to keep going. Even the Post Office Department, which prints the duck stamps, jumped on these sportsmen's funds and raised the printing ante from $32,000 in 1953 to $154,462 in 1954.

This isn't what duck hunters voluntarily asked to be taxed for. When the Duck Stamp Act was passed in 1934 it was thought that the $1 price of each stamp might be sufficient. Subsequently, in 1949, duck hunters asked that the price be raised to $2 a stamp and legislation was enacted to

do so. While the money from these stamps was primarily designed to acquire refuge lands for the wild waterfowl, out of the $44 million paid into the duck-stamp fund over the years, only $7.5 million, or about one-sixth of the total, has been used for this purpose. As against that, more than $25 million has been used for ordinary administrative expenses.

Mr. JOHNSON has put a bill in the hopper, H. R. 2142, which stipulates that 40 percent of duck-stamp revenues must be used for the purchase of waterfowl refuges. This bill is now pending before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The Budget Bureau and other Federal bureaus are opposed to earmarking any of these funds. It has been suggested that the amount obtained would be entirely inadequate for the purpose anyway, and that the cost of the duck stamp might be raised to say $5, or even more. Without legislation to protect this duck-stamp money and insure at least a fair portion of it going for the purpose which the duck hunters intended it to be spent, this would be useless, certainly in the light of past experience.

If you want the full story, write Representative JOHNSON at 340 House Office Building, Washington, D. C., and he will mail you a copy of his full report. Then let's get busy and do what we can to get this bill reported out of the committee for action on the floor of the House.

H. R. 2142 and similar bills are a long step forward. But their passage only solves one phase of the problem.

Complete protection of the duck hunters' investment in duck stamps also involves amending the law under which the Secretary of the Interior can wipe out refuges, without hearings, without notice to sportsmen and conservationists, even without discussion with interested groups.

So, even if we pass pending legislation earmarking duck-stamp funds for the acquisition of refuges, we will run this risk that these funds can be diverted by administrative officials, for the Secretary of the Interior can declare the lands so acquired surplus and they can be taken over by another agency and used for any other purpose, including a military target range.

Pending legislation would prevent this. My H. R. 5306, cosponsored in the House by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] and in the Senate by the junior Senator from Minnesota, Senator HUMPHREY, declare it to be the policy of Congress that national wildlife refuges be maintained and preserved. These bills provide that the Secretary of the Interior cannot dispose of or relinquish any of the national wildlife refuges, or parts thereof, without the approval of Congress.

Address by Hon. Barry M. Goldwater, of Arizona, Before the Michigan Christian Endeavor Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I delivered last Saturday, June 18, before the Michigan Christian Endeavor Convention, at Grand Rapids, Mich.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GOLDWATER BEFORE MICHIGAN CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR CONVENTION, GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., JUNE 18, 1955

It is a pleasure and a privilege to be here tonight and to have this opportunity of discussing with you the problems of our time.

In that great and penetrating play, Gioconda Smile, Aldous Huxley observes that confession is a convenient device by which we can unburden our conscience without the necessity of repentance or reform.

Let me confess that I am not the Senate's expert on foreign affairs.

I am not an expert on Russia, China, India, or the Middle East. I have no easy answer for the dilemma of our day.

I have no great academic achievement with which to dazzle you.

I am, I think, an ordinary citizen of the United States of America approaching middle age, constantly preoccupied with the responsibilities of an exacting job, but not quite anesthetized by the furious pace of our times.

It is flattering to be invited to speak to a group such as this, and your invitation is doubly cherished because I believe you and the people you represent are the custodians of all our hopes for a free and lasting peaceful world.

I am really not quite sure why I am here. I am not quite sure why you invited me. I am reminded somewhat of the man with the slight cold.

This man was driving to his office one morning when he realized he had a slightly scratchy throat, possibly the indication of some slight illness which might interrupt his plans for the weekend.

This chap had a friend who was a doctor, so he decided to stop at the doctor's office and get a shot of penicillin or some of these new antibiotics and cure his sore throat before it became serious. He entered the doctor's waiting room and was greeted by an attractive and impressive receptionist. "What is your name, please?" she asked.

The man smiled and said: "Oh, this isn't necessary. I know the doctor very well. Just tell Bill that Jim Blake is out here."

The receptionist noted his name and said: "Where do you live, Mr. Blake?" and began going through the other routine questions.

Well, our friend reluctantly gave her the information she desired and was ushered into a second waiting room.

In a moment a nurse came in, jabbed a thermometer in his mouth, told him to stand on the scales and began to add her bits of information to his history.

When she removed the thermometer so that he could again speak, he said: "Look, I'm not sick. There is nothing really wrong with me. I just—well, I think maybe I am getting a sore throat. I know Bill and I thought I would stop and get a shot or a pill or something. All this isn't necessary, really."

The nurse smiled and continued writing, and then she ushered him into a third waiting room and left him.

In a moment a second nurse came in, handed him one of those ridiculous smocks they give you in some doctors' offices, pointed to a closet and said: "Put your clothes in there and put this on," and out she went.

Our friend had no opportunity to protest. He stared at the smock and he stared at the closet and finally he took off his clothes and hung them up in the closet and put on the smock. And after some delay the second nurse returned and ushered him into a fourth room.

Here there were three other men, all garbed in these same ridiculous short smocks and all looking somewhat embarrassed.

Our friend stood there first on one foot and then the other and finally said: "Look, fellows, I'm not sick. There is really nothing wrong with me. I—well, I've got a little scratchy throat and I know Bill and I thought I'd stop and get a shot or a pill or something and a—well, I'm kind of embarrassed to be in here with you."

One of the other men standing in the corner looked at him for a minute, smiled, and then said: "You're embarrassed. I just came in to deliver a telegram."

Perhaps that's my mission tonight, to deliver a telegram, a message from the past.

I remember the story of a famous Frenchman, a general of the army, who had some difficulty, as we all do, in remembering names and faces. But he always seemed to get along very well and everywhere he met people who greeted him warmly and he returned their greetings.

One evening a friend said to him: "How do you remember all those people? How do you know to ask the questions you ask about their welfare?"

The general smiled and said: "Do you know exactly what I say? Do you remember?"

And his friend said: "Well, not exactly."

The general said: "When I can't think of a man's name or his regiment or where I met him before, I always begin by saying, 'And how is the old complaint?' Of course, everyone has at least one complaint and they immediately conclude that I have a particular, distinct recollection of their problem."

So tonight I refer to the problem of our time in the singular form. I suppose that many of us give that problem different shapes and different names—taxes, bills, family health, job security, Democrat politics, Republican politics, communism.

There are many problems in the world. They have one thing in common. They are inescapably linked with the future.

We must, of course, add to that list the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb and the cobalt bomb, atomic war.

All of these things concern us. But our concern is, primarily, linked with the future, with our children and their children. Most of us have fulfilled our purely biological purpose in life and half or two-thirds of our years lie behind us. Our concern is for mankind in general and for our children in particular.

It may be that we have come to the end of our time, that we have lived beyond our time, that our time actually ended on August 6, 1945, at Hiroshima. Looking beyond our purely local difficulties, we must be frighteningly aware of what is euphemistically referred to as a cold war, the worldwide struggle between the disciples of communism and the advocates of freedom.

Cold or hot, this issue is joined. It can have only one ultimate outcome, final victory for one side or the other.

Since the end of World War II, in this past decade, more than 500 million people have accepted, either willingly or as the result of force, the doctrine of communism.

The problem of our time is simple: Shall men be slave or free?

To you and to me and to all of us in America it is incredible that anyone could willingly commit themselves to the brutal tyranny that is communism. We are inclined to shrug it off as a mere manifestation of an upside-down world which inevitably must right itself.

We know that less than a million hard-core Communists rule and control the destiny of the Russian people. We wishfully believe that no more than 10 percent of the Chinese population are devotedly committed to the horrible brutality of Chou En-li.

In my home State of Arizona, an imposter named Peralta Rivas once laid claim to hun-

dreds of thousands of acres of fertile land in the central valleys of the State.

This swindler used the device of a forged Spanish land grant. And when his deception was discovered and the man who penetrated his trickery confronted him with it, Peralta Rivas said to his servant: "Oh, give the man some money."

Many of us in this Nation of ours today have adopted that attitude. And we say of the Communist menace: "Oh, give the men some money and be done with them."

Others place their reliance in superior force, in intercontinental bombers, in a great standing army. We behave something like the judge in a small midwestern town who was noted as a duck hunter.

The town's ne'er-do-well, a fellow named Dick, went out to the duckblinds one day without a dog, so Dick borrowed one from a nearby farmer. When he shot his first duck, he whistled for the dog and pointed to the bird, but the dog didn't plunge into the river. He walked out on top of the water, picked up the bird, and came back.

Dick shook his head 2 or 3 times and tried to remember how much he had had the night before. Then he went over and felt of the dog's belly and it was dry. The dog's legs were dry. So he concluded he really hadn't seen it at all.

Then Dick shot another duck and the same performance was repeated. And it was repeated again and again all through that day.

Dick returned the dog to his owner and made arrangements to borrow the same dog the next day. He knew that if he were to repeat the story in town, no one would believe it, so he invited the judge to accompany him the following day. They went out and borrowed the dog and went down to the blinds. Dick waited with ill-concealed impatience until the judge shot his first duck. And then Dick whistled for the dog and the dog walked out on top of the water, retrieved the bird, and came back. But the judge made no comment.

Dick concluded that perhaps the judge hadn't witnessed the recovery of that particular bird, so he waited until the judge shot his second bird and he called the dog and the dog walked out on the water and walked back with the bird. That went on all day, but the judge made no reference to it. They returned the dog to his owner and were on their way back to town when Dick, unable to contain himself any longer, turned to the judge and said: "Judge, didn't you notice something * * * well, unusual about that dog?"

To which the judge replied: "Well, I can tell you one thing. He can't swim a darned stroke."

So we see the Communist menace in all of its brutal manifestations and make little or no effort to understand it.

The appeal an idea has for a particular man frequently depends upon his point of departure, and there is one point of departure from which communism is most appealing, most logical. To understand this appeal, to be able to deal intelligently with it, we must explore first this point of departure. And for all its inconsistencies, the philosophy of communism does have an appeal when viewed from this perspective.

The basic premise of communism views man as an economic animal, a social animal, and a physical animal. And to all who accept this definition of man, communism speaks in different tongues.

To the millions of men, women, and children who go to bed every night of their lives hungry, who must spend every minute of every hour of every day to secure food and who, despite their devotion to this primary purpose, are never quite able to secure enough food to completely quiet the pangs of hunger, the Communist who says: "Accept my dictation and you will have all the food you can eat," is making a basic appeal, easily understood, and eagerly accepted.

To men and women in war-torn areas of the world where plunder and loot and rape have been the everyday occurrence, the Communist speaks of peace. He says: "Surrender your lives to my dictation and there will be no more bandit gangs or plunder or loot."

To the intellectual who is confused, concerned about the strife and the inequity of the world, the Communist says: "The welfare of the collective is the total goal. Surrender your talents and your abilities and your resources to us and we will bring peace and happiness and equal distribution of food and shelter to all mankind."

These promises all emphasize the material aspect of man. And why shouldn't they be appealing in our 20th century when man's ability to produce material things has increased a hundredfold?

The most obvious truth of the 20th century is this: Man has triumphed over his material surroundings. Science, engineering, the power of gasoline, coal, electricity, and now the atom, have all been unleashed to the end that we are now sometimes more fearful of our ability to consume than we are of our ability to produce.

For 175 years in this Nation, we have consistently emphasized the amazing benefits of man's collective effort. We have almost succeeded in making collectivism the end rather than the means.

We believe in free public education, and most States make school attendance compulsory up to a certain age.

We believe in the principle of trade unionism and collective bargaining.

We believe in collective compulsory social security.

We acknowledge that in many areas of human endeavor, combined action is necessary.

Some of our outstanding examples are in private ownership, such as the telephone combines, big business, General Motors, privately owned electric light and power companies. All of these things are basically a collective action. Private capital pools its resources, management's brains are joined together, and great labor forces are recruited.

The Chinese coolie can see very little real difference between Consolidated Edison and TVA.

Indeed, in the past 30 years, the social and economic structure of our country has embraced a great many programs which are collective in nature.

We say it is our purpose to accomplish the greatest good for the greatest number of people.

The Communist will tell you that is precisely what world communism proposes. And make no mistake about this. The masterminds of the Kremlin have never wavered for an instant in their basic objective, which is to conquer the entire world for communism.

This struggle must continue until one side or the other is total victor.

This is not a political contest, or a military contest, or an economic contest. It is, rather, a contest to establish by force or persuasion a philosophical definition of man himself.

World communism is dedicated to the task of accomplishing by whatever means available, treachery, treason, brutality, or warfare, the acceptance of Karl Marx's definition of man as a social, economic, physical animal whose existence can only be justified as he serves the all-powerful state.

What is the basic difference between their belief and ours? It is an ancient truth: That man is not merely a social, economic, and physical animal but a spiritual animal as well.

And you and I and too many of us are guilty of mere passive acquiescence to that ancient truth.

We regard freedom as the product of a political system, and nothing could be more dangerously false than that belief.

Freedom is the necessary state of man because man is the child of Almighty God with an important, immortal, individual soul, because man is a spiritual being as well as a physical being.

We have been quite willing to accept the benefits of the Judo-Christian civilization with its concept of individual freedom, with its cultural and economic advantages, and all the opportunities of the 20th century, but we have been unwilling to display that devotion, to make that passionate affirmation which is required of all of us if we are ever to solve man's basic problem.

We have more material advantages than any other people on earth. We know how to make refrigerators and ranges and automobiles and telephones.

And of all the nations of the world, we alone can produce more food than our population can possibly consume.

We are also the irreverent disbelievers, the cynical sophisticated products of a purely materialistic society.

We have made it fashionable to disbelieve, and in our business world and our professional life, and especially in our schools and our homes, we have classed faith with superstition.

Oh, we are successful all right. We have the richest nation on earth. We think we have self government. We even cherish the idea we have freedom.

We have all these things, material things.

I suggest we have everything except that one thing without which all these things we do have are valueless and transitory.

And that one thing is a universal firm faith in Almighty God, faith to define and understand this basic struggle which must inevitably occupy the minds of all the world until total victory.

We must first of all penetrate the propaganda, the economic and military and social smokescreens and define the basic difference between what you and I call Communist slavery as opposed to American freedom.

Let me read you what Karl Marx had to say. He said: "The democratic concept of man is false because it is Christian. The democratic concept holds that each man is a sovereign being. This is the illusion, dream and postulate of Christianity."

Adolf Hitler, the slavemaster of the Third Reich, had something to say on this subject. He said: "To the Christian doctrine of the infinite significance of the individual human soul I oppose with icy clarity the saving doctrine of the nothingness and the insignificance of the human being."

There is no room on this earth for the existence of these two diametrically opposed concepts of man.

If we are to win the cold war or the hot war, if our way of life is to endure, we can only be victorious after we have all come to a clear understanding of the basic difference between these two adversaries.

I am sure that you, and the people you represent in this gathering of the Christian Endeavor Union, have been aware of this ancient conflict. I am sure you are aware of the only path we can follow to win ultimate peace and ultimate victory for the individual. It is our commission then to make this ancient truth known to all men, both free and slave.

To reject our society's passive acquiescence and to substitute for it a militant affirmation, to reject the idea of collectivism and man's significance only as a tool of the state, and to establish instead not only in our land but throughout the world an acceptance and understanding of man himself, which can

only come when we raise our voices together to repeat with passionate affirmation:

"I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of Heaven and earth."

If we want peace and freedom for the future, if we desire the defeat of the evil brutality of the philosophy of Marx and Engels, the way is open for us and the power is present for us to use.

But we will never achieve the victory until we stop mumbling about man's creation in politics, in economics and society, until we reject the idea of collectivism's philosophical aspects which require the surrender and subjugation of the individual.

Of course man is a physical and an economic and a social animal. But he is first and eternally a spiritual creation in whom their lives the divine spark of Almighty God. And there will be peace and prosperity and progress, and there will be an end to brutality and privation and exploitation, only when men recognize and accept the truth of their creation.

All of these evils will be defeated and disappear when the world on its knees says: "Oh God, who art the author of peace and lover of concord, in knowledge of whom standeth our eternal life, whose service is perfect freedom, defend us, Thy humble servants, from all assaults of our enemies, that we, surely trusting in thy defense, may not fear the power of any adversaries, through the might of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

The United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 10th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. During those years the aggressive designs of the Soviet Union and their Chinese counterpart have made our search for an enduring peace increasingly difficult. Despite this cold war pressure, we have today arrived at a most significant juncture. The United Nations, 10 years after its formation is not only still in existence, but it is receiving increased respect and cooperation throughout the world. Nations not yet admitted clamor loudly for permission to join. The ideals for which Woodrow Wilson fought and died have survived the test of time. We can all agree too, that the United States has given up no cherished right nor turned over to the U. N. any constitutional privilege.

I hope that we will always have the courage and honesty to recognize the wisdom and greatness of President Harry Truman's decision to go into Korea after the Communist attack. That show of conviction and faith in the cause of free people and in the United Nations will prove the turning point in the history of the U. N. It marks the distinction between the success of the United Nations and the failure of the League of Nations.

We can be thankful today that because there is that U. N., we have peace and a forum in which to discuss the world's ills; we should be thankful too that we have a U. N. helping the poor and the backward of the world toward economic and social betterment. I pray that we shall continue to support the United Nations and its glowing promise of peace.

Tribute to North Andover, Mass.—A Famous American Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the strength of the United States is not measured by steel tonnage, millions of motor vehicles, or the mass production of cap-and-gowned June graduates.

They are the superstructure, visible to the eyes of 1955.

For the foundation, and the guiding spirit, we look back to the early settlements, where men and women were the most important facts of life.

Where courage, and character, and independence, were the pioneering virtues. That constitutes the vital life force at work on our mechanized farms and in our assembly-line cities of today; visible but dynamic.

There is something about a small town or village that gives folks elbowroom to develop to their full stature.

Before the cities summon them to leadership.

As one scans through "Who's Who"—or the pages of American history—one is impressed by the fact that our Nation is nourished by the big men who have their roots in small communities.

North Andover, in Massachusetts, which recently celebrated its 100th anniversary as a town, helped to blaze the trail that has led to greatness.

North Andover, where the first settler staked out his homestead in 1646.

Where the spinning wheels and the hand plows produced self-reliance and gave the richer yield of poets, preachers, and statesmen, to the Nation.

The Eagle-Tribune of Lawrence, Mass., has published a North Andover centennial edition to honor its next-door neighbor, dated Saturday, June 11, 1955.

The lead-off article titled "North Andover—A Town To Be Proud of," sets the stage and the mood in language that all will relish.

To give credit where credit is due, I request consent to open up a wider audience for this descriptive piece of writing, through insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Credit to be shared by the Eagle-Tribune Publishing Co., and by the very competent newspaperman who authored the preface to the centennial edition, Chief Editorial Writer Joseph A. Reynolds, of Lawrence, Mass.

The preface to the centennial edition follows:

NORTH ANDOVER—A TOWN TO BE PROUD OF—1855–1955

Mapmakers have tedious jobs to do sometimes, as when they must measure and outline the conformations of a flat, dull region where there is nothing for the eye to exult in. Mapmakers love North Andover, upon which the great glacier exerted its vast creative pressure with surprising gentleness, and, sliding then into the sea, left North Andover all hollows and hills, and delightful.

And North Andover's spiritual topography is fully remarkable as its physical topography.

Spiritually, North Andover is bounded on the far side by such as Ann Bradstreet and her husband Simon (whom by history's caprice she now overshadows), and by such as Samuel Osgood and Phillips Brooks, all tradition makers. It is bounded on the near side by good citizens of the present day who take their lineal responsibilities as seriously as if the ancentral hand were present to beckon them to this duty. It is bounded on the east by the rising sun which symbolizes its awakening to new vistas of an almost blinding radiance. It is bounded on the west by a sunset which symbolizes the splendid fulfillment of a day of rich promise.

North Andover, observing its centennial, is, of course, taking particular note of its spiritual boundaries during these retrospective days which have been given over to celebration. It likes what it sees, as goes without saying. But, being sensible, it possibly mistrusts its own testimony as possibly having a weight of bias which possibly cants it to one side.

We therefore summon as impartial witnesses North Andover's closest friends and neighbors—Andover, Lawrence, and Methuen—and, polling them for their opinion as to whether North Andover has a right to be proud of what it has made out of its first 100 years as a town, discover that there is complete agreement that North Andover has every right to be proud.

It is a finding in which this newspaper concurs in most heartily.

Petition To Withdraw From the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, 24 citizens of Santa Barbara, Calif., have petitioned Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, praying that the Charter of the United Nations be not revised and that the United States terminate its membership in that organization. The petition reads as follows:

PETITIONING SEPARATION FROM THE UNITED NATIONS

We, the undersigned, citizens of Santa Barbara, Calif., do hereby go on record that we are unalterably opposed to any revision of the United Nations Charter.

We also believe that the United States should terminate its membership in the United Nations, and that the United Nations should be forever removed from our shores.

We do not believe that the United Nations has kept the peace. On the contrary, we believe that it is plunging us down the road to one-world government, such a government to be held together by force, not peace.

Our forefathers, with the aid of God and His Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, carved forth a mighty land, these United States of America. Our Constitution was founded on the Holy Bible. Our inalienable rights were derived from our Creator, not from government. But now we are faced with a Godless

international setup that has grown to gigantic proportions, and that is working night and day to break down our walls of national sovereignty, to steal our precious blood-bought freedom from us, and to destroy forever our way of life. This petition is an open, free expression of the views of the undersigned.

Ann Gilbert, Edith Gilbert, Dr. Edward C. Bowlen, Mrs. Charles Mattei, Mrs. D. C. Reynolds, Baker L. Adams, Elizabeth Clay, Tina Todesca, Marion B. Phillips, Barbara S. Whittaker, Florence C. Sorensen, Mary M. Coulter, Roger C. Colburn, Cornelia B. Houier, Jessie J. Wieske, M. C. Brelita, Rusk Bawley, Anne E. Kermode, Doris W. Hopwood, Doris Caswell, L. Merle Berry, Joe W. Berry, Libau B. Stevens, Mrs. Warren E. Drewe.

These patriotic people are fully aware that the real purpose behind the present activities of the United Nations is to revise its charter in order to have it sponsor a world government.

It seems to me that the United Nations has already done enough in interfering with our laws and the Constitution to convince the people that "world peace" is not its aim, but its true object is to destroy the Constitution and laws of the only country on earth where it is demonstrated that the Government exists for the people, and not the reverse—of the people existing for the Government.

Results of 1955 Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I mailed an opinion questionnaire to the Democrat and Republican voters in the 25th Congressional District. My purpose was to obtain the views of my constituents on some of the important issues facing our country. One questionnaire was mailed to each home in the district.

Following the procedure I established in previous years, I invited my constituents to write additional comments on the questionnaire form. The response to this invitation has been overwhelming—so overwhelming, in fact, that it is impossible to send individual replies to those who answered the questionnaire. To date, more than 27,000 answers have been received. This is a greater interest than has ever been shown before by the voters of the 25th Congressional District. I am extremely pleased at this interest in representative government because it is only through knowledge of what the people want that we as elected representatives can adequately follow their wishes.

Of particular significance was question No. 9, in which I asked for advice concerning President Eisenhower's legislative program. The fact that 84.1 percent advocated support is indicative of the high esteem in which our President is held. It is also indicative of the confidence which has been restored in the highest office of the land.

The following is the compilation of answers:

1. Should the United States use atomic weapons against the Chinese Communists if they attack Formosa? Yes, 62.6 percent; no, 25.2 percent; no opinion, 12.2 percent.

2. Should the United States continue membership in the United Nations? Yes, 80.6 percent; no, 14.4 percent; no opinion, 5 percent.

3. Should every male American be required to serve in the Armed Forces under a universal military training program? Yes, 73.3 percent; no, 20.4 percent; no opinion, 6.3 percent.

4. Do you favor medical treatment at taxpayers' expense for veterans whose illnesses or injuries are not caused by military service? Yes, 20.3 percent; no, 76.9 percent; no opinion, 2.8 percent.

5. Do you favor legislation to prevent a person from losing his job if he refuses to join a labor union? Yes, 72.1 percent; no, 24.5 percent; no opinion, 3.4 percent.

6. Should the postage rates on letters be increased from 3 cents to 4 cents in order to reduce the postal deficit? Yes, 64.6 percent; no, 28.5 percent; no opinion, 6.9 percent.

7. Do you favor a pay increase for Federal employees? Yes, 58 percent; no, 20.9 percent; no opinion, 21.1 percent.

8. Which should be admitted as States? Hawaii, 12.5 percent; Alaska, 5.8 percent; both, 70 percent; neither, 11.7 percent.

9. In general, what should I, as your elected Representative, do about President Eisenhower's legislative program? Support it, 84.1 percent; oppose it, 4.6 percent; no opinion, 11.3 percent.

Baiting: Ducks and Civil Servants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, June 17, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] defended the Department of the Interior against what he called attacks "inspired by political motives and designed to impair public confidence in its activities."

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that public confidence in the Interior Department has been rudely shaken long before I chose to level my attack on Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay. If it is politics to protest what is happening to our conservation programs then I plead guilty. I consider it the proper function of a Democratic Congressman to keep a watchful eye on a Republican administration which seems bent on giving away our natural resources.

CONSERVATIONISTS HOPPING MAD

Conservationists prefer to spend their time in the out of doors. But the deterioration of this country's conservation standards has brought many of them hopping mad into congressional offices to save what is left of our timberland, our wildlife, our soil, our water, and our other natural resources.

Here is what Spencer Smith, secretary of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, has to say on the administration's performance in the field of conservation:

JUNE 18, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: I noted with more than passing interest that Congressman MILLER cautioned conservationists to disassociate themselves from the critics of the administration. If not explicitly stated, Congressman MILLER certainly implies that you are leading us down the garden path and that we should beware. Though we are grateful for the solicitude of the Congressman, we are saddened by the thought that he apparently is oblivious of, or agrees with, the record this administration is making in the field of conservation. I hasten to add that conservationists are not oriented in any politically partisan fashion to the problems to which many of us are urging the Nation's attention.

NO POLITICAL INTRIGUE

Many of us feel our criticism is germane and warranted on the record that has been made and on the policies proclaimed by the administration. No political spokesman affected any intrigue to cause conservationists to oppose what has been called the Nation's biggest boondoggle and the unwarranted invasion of Echo Park. No duress was manifest in the overwhelming number of conservationists that opposed the grazing or multipurpose bill that sought to seriously handicap the proper management of the national forests. No political soothsayer mesmerized conservationists in supporting budgets well in excess of that requested by administration leaders for needed conservation. Unfortunately, this list could be considerably extended.

It is this record that has occasioned the criticism by conservationists. Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, president of the Wildlife Management Institute, renowned conservationist, and the first director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, said, in a talk before the Citizens Planning Conference on Parks and Open Spaces for the American People in Washington on May 24: "There has, however, been a growing doubt in the minds of many conservationists as to whether the welfare of the resource is now being given sufficient consideration by those responsible for the administration of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

"Former Undersecretary of Interior Ralph Tudor, following his resignation, stated in an article in the Saturday Evening Post that the waterfowl administration had been set up to please the California duck hunters, and a review of the record provides some evidence to support this statement.

"Mr. Harold Titus, editor of the Field and Stream magazine, noted in the May issue that the United States Fish and Wildlife Service was hardly exemplary in its management of wildlife resources. Titus stated that never before in his years of contact with this Federal agency did he find such a disturbing lack of prompt and decisive response to his questions.

CANNOT BE BRUSHED ASIDE

"These men are hardly wide-eyed political partisans nor are they convenient and willing tools for those, who may view these problems solely from partisan vantage points. They cannot be brushed aside as unimportant nor can they be answered by a series of non sequiturs showing that many culprits have been caught in violation of conservation laws. Simply laying hands upon many violators does nothing to overcome other problems, which through administrative interpretation may be as great or greater than those they are so vigorously prosecuting.

Conservationists the country over are watching the management of the Nation's resources. They represent a variety of shades and differences of political faiths but their

common interest is in the proper management of these resources and when, in their considered judgment, a serious lack of responsibility is evident in this management they will insist that those responsible face up to this lack—be he Republican or Democrat.

Here is what Mr. I. T. Quinn, executive director of the Virginia Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries, has to say in his letter to me of June 9, 1955:

I want to express my appreciation for the speech which you delivered on the floor of the House on June 8.

WAITING FOR STATES

At the meeting in March of the American Wildlife Conference in Montreal after Mr. John L. Farley, the present Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the United States Department of the Interior, had closed his address, I asked him from the floor if the United States Fish and Wildlife Service had any policy with reference to baiting waterfowl. His reply was "We do not have—we are waiting to see what the States are going to do."

Here is what Mrs. C. N. Edge, chairman of the Emergency Conservation Committee, 767 Lexington Avenue, New York City, says in her letter to me of June 13, 1955:

Many thanks for the speech of June 8 on the waterfowl situation. You doubtless remember that this committee, in cooperation with Dr. Hornaday, put an end to the baiting of waterfowl. Mr. Irving Brant's pamphlets on this subject are the historic record of that fight.

I am greatly impressed with the numbers and spirit of the conservationists who are aroused against the anti conservation philosophy of the present administration.

Here is what Les Woerpel, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Federation of Conservation Clubs, says in a letter to me of June 10, 1955:

We think you did a splendid job on a mess that needs to be brought out into the light so that it can dry out and lose some of the stink that has accumulated around it.

FARLEY'S WEAK ANSWER

The papers have carried John Farley's answer to your speech. However, it is a weak answer and includes material that is just as open to censure as any of the actions of the Fish and Wildlife Service or Department of Interior in other matters. That is the outright admission that local authorities have allowed baiting to divert the ducks from crops in the California rice fields.

While we sympathize with the loss these people sustain, we do not agree that State and Federal agencies have any right, or responsibility, to have to protect those producers. Concessions to those particular producers could conceivably boomerang in all other parts of the country and in many other fields of wildlife management.

It is no more right that sportsmen of California should bait the ducks away from rice fields, and incidentally into the range of the sportsmen's gun than it is for this State to allow sportsmen to put out salt licks near the muck farmer's lands to entice deer away from the vegetable crops that they love so well. Neither is it right to protect the fall crops of Californians while the winter wheat and rye farmers lose whole fields to migratory waterfowl returning to the north in the spring.

Certainly no one would suggest a spring season with baiting to entice the birds away from those fields, which would be just as sensible and justifiable. Migratory waterfowl, as well as deer and other species, are a part of the calculated risks that producers must take when entering into their field of endeavor.

The theory that the Government must protect them from wildlife or other hazards is invalid and preposterous. Concessions in this direction only make the practice more ridiculous and set precedents which may lead to unlimited destruction of species and breakdown of regulations.

Thanks again for helping us with this fight, we appreciate it a lot.

SPORTSMEN HEARTILY ENDORSE STAND

Here is what Jeff Whitehill, president of the Milwaukee Gun Club and past president of the Fin and Feather Club, says in his telegram to me of June 10, 1955:

Congratulations on your impressive fight against duck shooting over baited ponds and marshes. All sportsmen in this locality heartily endorse your stand in bringing this situation to the attention of the public at large. It is about time that the law regained some semblance of dignity by strict enforcement—too many fixers who are permitted to evade the law for their own selfish interests continue to promote disrespect for the law.

The charge I made against the Department of the Interior in this matter of duck-baiting is perfectly simple and straightforward. I charged that Ralph A. Tudor, until recently Undersecretary of Interior, announced in a national magazine, the Saturday Evening Post, that California bankers demanded a change in the Fish and Wildlife Service. These bankers told Tudor that they wanted John Farley, and Farley is now Fish and Wildlife Service Director. Albert M. Day, who had for 7 years been Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, was eased out to make way for this candidate of the California bankers.

UNDER FARLEY GOVERNMENT WINKED AT VIOLATIONS

Since Farley's ascendancy, the Federal Government has winked at flagrant violations of the Federal ban on baiting by 140 duck-hunting clubs in California, where so-called "sportsmen" had been openly shooting ducks lured by grain placed as close as 200 yards from the guns. This disregard by the Department of the Interior of its own antibaiting law has infected enforcement of the antibaiting law elsewhere. High administrative officials have taken to browbeating Fish and Wildlife Service agents who are trying to enforce the antibaiting law in such areas as Ohio and Maryland.

Following my remarks on June 8 in which I made these charges, the Department of the Interior called a press conference the next day to reply to the charge that the Department is winking at the baiting of ducks.

FLAGRANT VIOLATIONS IN CALIFORNIA

The Department's defense No. 1 was that the basic antibaiting law has not been changed. I didn't say that it had been changed. What I said was that the Fish and Wildlife Service had for two seasons, under Director Farley, done nothing about the flagrant violations of the Federal law by 140 duck clubs in California, which are openly practicing baiting. It is no answer to say that an antibaiting law is on the books if that law can be violated with impunity.

The Department's defense No. 2 had to do with my assertion that in the last hunting season, despite the flagrant violations in California of the Federal antibaiting law, not a single arrest for violation of the Federal law had been made. At the press conference, Director Farley asserted that there had been 17 such arrests last season in California by Fish and Wildlife agents.

ARRESTS FOR STATE VIOLATION ONLY

I have asked for and received a breakdown of these 17 cases, and I find that not one of them was for violation of the Federal antibaiting law. All of the 17 were for violations, not of the Federal law, but of the California regulation which, far from forbidding baiting, actually encourages it. So I am going to stand on my original statement that not a single arrest for violation of the Federal antibaiting law was made in California during the 1954 season.

ADMINISTRATION'S NUMBERS GAME

Since baiting was going on right and left, this is not a very vigorous enforcement record. This is another example of the numbers game which this administration seems to delight in playing.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], after his plea to keep politics out of conservation, went on to accuse Mr. Albert M. Day of having been "caught redhanded shooting ducks in an area which had been baited with corn a day earlier" in 1949. After I had read this charge printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Friday, June 17, I wrote the following letter to Mr. Day:

JUNE 17, 1955.

MY DEAR MR. DAY: In yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (pp. 8222–8223) appears a statement by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] in which he accuses you of having been "caught red-handed shooting ducks in an area which had been baited with corn a day earlier" in 1949. This is a serious criminal charge. Indeed, it charges that you committed the very offense that the Department of the Interior has been condoning ever since you were removed as Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

I wish to give you an opportunity to reply to this charge if you wish to do so.

Very truly yours,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

I insert here Mr. Day's reply:

FIRST OPPORTUNITY TO DENY MALICIOUS ACCUSATIONS

JUNE 20, 1955.

DEAR MR. REUSS: I have your letter of June 17, and appreciate the opportunity to reply. It is the first opportunity that I have had to officially deny the malicious accusations presented to the subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during the 83d Congress.

The charges against me were made in secret, closed sessions of the subcommittee by 2 or possibly 3 disgruntled former subordinate employees. I was denied the privilege of facing my accusers and, in fact, was not even given an opportunity to appear before the subcommittee, even though I requested it. Because the testimony of my accusers has been kept secret I have never had a chance to study it. Congressman MILLER's statement in the June 16 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing portions of this still secret testimony is the first time that I have actually seen anything of what transpired at the hearings.

Secretary McKay told me many months ago that the Department had a copy of the subcommittee report, and I asked him to permit me to review it and prepare a reply. That privilege was never accorded to me.

DENY LIBELOUS CHARGES

It has thus seemed evident that the allegations lack substance. Otherwise, I am certain that either the Committee or the Department would have taken appropriate action long ago.

I categorically deny the libelous charges that I was ever caught red-handed shooting over bait. It is postively untrue. Furthermore, I would have been glad to appear before any fair-minded tribunal at any time to discuss this or any other alleged misdeeds, and I stand ready to do so now.

My administration of the Fish and Wildlife Service was characterized by vigorous enforcement of all protective laws and regulations which, in turn, were based upon the best scientific data obtainable. It is a matter of record that, during my term as Director, waterfowl populations steadily rose from a dangerously low level to one of relative abundance. I have been an outdoorsman since boyhood, have dedicated my life to the cause of conservation, and violating any of the laws and regulations established to protect the fish and wildlife resources of the Nation is the last thing I would ever consciously do.

Thanks for giving me an opportunity at long last to reply to these unfair and unfounded accusations.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT M. DAY.

This House has quite recently expressed itself on the kind of treatment given Mr. Day by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the 83d Congress headed by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

HOUSE RULES ON EXECUTIVE SESSION

By House Resolution 151, passed by this House on March 23, 1955, which amends Rule XI (25), it is provided that—

(m) If the committee determines that evidence or testimony at an investigative hearing may tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person, it shall—

(1) receive such evidence in executive session;

(2) afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness; and

(3) receive and dispose of requests from such person to subpena additional witnesses.

(o) No evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the committee.

Mr. Day was afforded no opportunity to appear and answer the criminal charges made against him.

ACCUSED IN KANGAROO COURT

Instead, he has been accused by obviously hearsay evidence in a secret session of a kangaroo court. And the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] has seen fit to use the evidence taken in executive session publicly in the RECORD. If there are criminal charges to be made against Mr. Day, let them be made publicly, and let him have an opportunity to know the charge and to defend himself openly in a court of law.

Meanwhile, the conservationists of this country are not going to be decoyed from their mission, which is to prevent the Department of the Interior from giving away our waterfowl to the duck-baiters.

District of Columbia Bar Association Deserves the Nation's Thanks and Appreciation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Bar Association of the District of Columbia did honor to its own best traditions and served the country well when it created last January a special committee to provide legal counsel in security cases for Federal employees unable to obtain counsel of their own choice or to pay for legal aid. A recent report on the work of this special committee shows that in the succeeding 5 months it obtained clearances for employees in 13 of 22 cases which were set for hearings; and 9 cases are still to be decided.

This perfect record to date is a tribute to the care and conscientiousness with which the members of the special committee handled the cases assigned to them. As the Washington Post and Times Herald says editorially this morning, "They deserve the thanks of the country as well as of their individual clients for their promotion of justice—and the more so since these are nonremunerative cases. But the record is also in part a commentary on the sloppiness and emptiness of security charges. Most of these cases should never have arisen; most of the security risk charges should never have been made."

I introduced on January 20, 1955, House Joint Resolution 154, a companion measure to the resolution offered in the Senate by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and Senator JOHN STENNIS. This resolution has just been favorably reported to the Senate for its consideration.

There are increasing signs of doubt about the abrogation of the Bill of Rights by the Federal Government which effectively deprives millions of American citizens of the ancient protections of our Constitution. Hired informers and offically encouraged poison-pen letterwriters which have been the hallmarks of the totalitarian regimes of Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin have no place in American life. Despite the reluctance of the present administration to face up to the problem it must prepare for careful reform of the present un-American activities or be prepared to face the consequences.

I am proud to include here the editorial tribute to the Bar Asosciation of the District of Columbia for a task magnificently conceived and executed.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 20, 1955]

TAKING "RISKS"

The Bar Association of the District of Columbia did honor to its own best traditions when it created a special committee last January to provide legal counsel in security cases for Government employees unable to obtain counsel of their own choice or to pay for regular legal aid. In the succeeding 5 months it obtained clearances for employees in 13 of 22 cases which were set for hearings; 9 cases are still to be decided. It appears, therefore, that the volunteer attorneys have thus far scored a perfect record.

The record is a tribute in part, of course, to the care and conscientiousness with which the committee members handled the cases assigned to them. They deserve the thanks of the country as well as of their individual clients for their promotion of justice—and the more so since these are nonremunerative cases. But the record is also in part a commentary on the sloppiness and emptiness of security charges. Most of these cases should never have arisen; most of the security risk charges should never have been made.

The report of the committee chairman, former Assistant Attorney General James M. McInerney, discloses how little the law has been able to do toward the elimination of injustice in the security program. After remarking that when it was first established, the committee was virtually inundated with inquiries, he said:

"A large number of these employees could not be helped because they had already forfeited their rights by submitting their resignations upon request, during or after a security investigation. Others had attempted to represent themselves without counsel and had been unsuccessful."

What a travesty this makes of the Civil Service Commission's security risk figures. We hope that the bar association's experience in dealing with this sample of security risk cases will lead it to champion the speedy revision of a program which in its present form too often serves the interests neither of security nor of justice.

Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, among the claims being made about the proposed upper Colorado River project is that it would be high-cost development.

Editor Ken Byerly comments on this in a recent issue of his Lewistown (Mont.) Daily News.

Mr. Byerly is quick to point out that part of the opposition to development of the upper Colorado River comes from downstream water users and that part of the opposition comes from those who oppose any reclamation development in the West.

Irrigation projects, as Mr. Byerly says, "are our life blood, and we must continue to work toward the development of every feasible irrigation project possible."

The editorial follows:

BANANAS ON PIKES PEAK?

What is your reaction to the following from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which is a quotation from Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California?

"Mr. Speaker, the Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the LaBarge irrigation project in Wyoming.

"The LaBarge project is a part of the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

"The cost to the Nation's taxpayers of the LaBarge project would be $1,250 an acre.

"The project would grow agricultural products now supported by the taxpayers and in great surplus. Among these are grains, dairy products, and wool."

We don't know whether or not the California Congressman is right or wrong on his figures.

But we do know that southern California wants all the water from the Colorado River valley for its own use, and is opposed to any irrigation project in the upper valley which will benefit the people where the water comes from.

If the proposed LaBarge project would cost $1,250 an acre, we agree with Representative HOSMER that it is too expensive.

However, we have a deep suspicion of most people from other parts of the country who oppose irrigation projects anywhere in the West. Such projects are important to this country. They are our life blood, and we must continue to work toward the development of every feasible irrigation project possible.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress need not appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak. But it should appropriate funds for needed irrigation and reclamation projects in the West.

It is conservatively estimated that the food needs of this country in 1975 will be 40 percent higher than they were in 1950.

During these 25 years an estimated 15 million acres of farmland will be lost to expanding nonfarm facilities, and 25 million acres will be lost by soil erosion.

Irrigation and reclamation projects will help provide the 20 million to 30 million acres in new cropland needed by 1975, as well as the 20-percent increase in production per acre needed to meet our food requirements only 20 years from now.

These projects will produce agricultural products which would otherwise eventually be in short supply. Among these are grains, livestock, and dairy products.

Address by Hon. Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives, at the Commencement Exercises at West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va., May 30, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a speech given by the Honorable SAM RAYBURN at the commencement exercises at West Virginia University, Morgantown, and in the words of one of the members of the board of governors, it was one of the finest speeches ever delivered at the university and by one of America's outstanding statesmen. I recommend to every Member of the House the reading of this thought-provoking and informative message:

President Stewart, Congressman STAGGERS, members of the board, members of the graduating class, and friends, I am happy to be in West Virginia again, and especially to be at the University of West Virginia where my friend of many years, Dr. Irvin Stewart, is president.

I am also glad to meet here your very capable Congressman, HARLEY STAGGERS.

The University of West Virginia has been a great center of learning and inspiration to the youth, not only of West Virginia, but in many other parts of our country.

Before addressing myself to the subject that I have come here to discuss with you, I want to say a word about your generation, the so-called younger generation.

I have lived quite a while but I know that I shall be old, only when, some day, I find myself sitting around with others bewailing the younger generation and talking about how much better we did things in our day. Yet in every generation, some of the older people have sat around bemoaning the younger generation, and I suppose that some of you, too, in time, will do the same thing. However, I hope this blight will never descend upon you.

I have unbounded admiration for the younger generation.

Sometime before we entered the last world war, professional croakers were saying that the young men of our day were too soft to fight. They had had it too easy. I never shared these silly doubts. And we know, that when the time came, the young men of our armed services were as good as they ever had been in Andrew Jackson's day.

I am certain, if unhappily, the test on a great scale should come again, that again they will prove that no people excel us in patriotism, devotion to duty, courage, and the willingness to defend this great Nation of ours, whatever the cost.

What is true in this respect of young men is also true of our young women. Thousands of them entered the armed services and the Red Cross and saw service all over the world. Thousands of others of all ages toiled in munitions plants or did jobs of various kinds for the Government. There was no weakness among them, not even when their husbands or sons went off to war, leaving them lonely and waiting, as women are always left lonely and waiting in wartime. They did their duty; and they did it well. I admire them equally with the young men.

Since a country is, first of all, people, and no country is better than its people are, I do not tremble for the future of this country. Ever since Washington wrought, and Jefferson lead and taught, we have had moaners and groaners in this country that have been saying that our freedom is imperiled and that our Government is being changed. Some people have said that all of our leaders, from Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln, to now, have been incompetents. They said we couldn't possibly pay our debts. We couldn't expand any further. It was impossible to find markets for the things we produced, and since Congress was composed of incompetents, you couldn't depend upon them for anything. It didn't matter what political party was in power at any given time.

Well, the country hasn't been ruined yet, and I don't see any prospect of it being ruined. The more the croakers croaked, the more the country grew.

During the depression we were told that grass would soon be growing in the streets of our cities. That hasn't happened.

In my opinion, we're just getting underway in these United States. There is, indeed, little that Americans cannot do, if only they can imagine themselves wanting to do it. It matters not what mistakes any administration in Washington may make, I believe we can overcome them. The potentials of our resources, material and spiritual, have never yet been tapped to the utmost. We still do not know the limits of our strength. Let those beware, therefore, who think that they will find us easy prey.

Here in the United States we have grown both in bigness and greatness. This was a great country long before it became a big country.

It was a great country in the very beginning because the men who founded it breathed greatness into it. At the time of our Revolutionary War we were about 3 million people thinly scattered across the face of a huge and largely unknown continent. But small though we were, and weak, we shook 18th century Europe to the core. For at a period when absolutism prevailed nearly everywhere, and few men had rights, we announced the stupendous, earth-shaking doctrine of the rights of man, and so became the light of the world. The more so as the total darkness of communism casts its evil shadows upon larger and larger areas of the earth.

We founded upon this continent a nation without precedent in the history of man. The founders met at Philadelphia in May 1787, and in 4 short months, in September of the same year, they brought forth a document that the great English statesman, Gladstone, said was the greatest document ever struck off at one time by the hand and brain of man. This country was made up of members of all the racial stocks of the world. People of different religious and political faiths, many of them had never been able to live peacefully together in their native homes. But here the lion and the lamb lay down together. Out of unparalleled diversity we created an incomparable unity. Nor is this all. Our political-economic system has given more people more happiness and prosperity over a wider area for a longer period of time than any system ever created by men in their long history.

I do not say that it is a perfect system. I do not maintain that its blessings extend to all alike. I do not claim that it is without aberrations or inequities. But neither do I apologize for it. For this, I believe, is true. Men are not angels. It is not, therefore, criminal that inequities should exist among us. But it would be criminal if we should ignore them. This we will not do.

Farmers, for a long time, did not share in the general prosperity of the country. But by and large, some measure of prosperity has for some time been guaranteed them through various acts of the Government. Organized labor was long repressed in many sections of this Nation. But labor has now become a gigantic force of its own. Similarly, decade after decade, we have extended the boundaries of education; this great university and the splendid colleges and schools of West Virginia being proof of it in this State. We have made such strides in the field of preventive medicine that we have eradicated diseases that were a scourge but a little while ago. And the life expectancy of the average American is the highest in the world.

I could stand here all day reciting items of our progress, spiritual and material, but that is not necessary. Yet some of us are foolish enough to be put on the defensive by Communists when we have done so much for men and they have done so much evil to mankind.

There remains a great deal to do, and I believe there exists among us the will to do it. We are a highly competent people. But no American, worthy of the name, thinks that competence is enough. We are also, the Lord be praised, a humane people. And when you add humaneness to competence, you get the unique American civilization that we have created. It is a civilization in which men, remembering God, do not forget their suffering brothers, here or elsewhere.

We have also done well in international affairs in the last twenty-odd years. We have done especially well when you remember that for the greater part of the life of this Republic, we were outside the stream of history. We came into it only in 1917 with our entry into the First World War.

In a way, we were innocent of the world because we had led a sheltered life. For the span of a dynamic century—from Waterloo in 1815 to the outbreak of the First World War in 1914—we conquered the West, imported millions of people to build America, dug mines, harnessed rivers, cleared land, built factories, schools, churches, and firmly laid the foundations of our strength. We spent little on arms because we did not need them.

We were able to do so—let us remember—because during all of that century, Great Britain, then the world's leading power, patrolled the earth and largely kept the peace.

After coming into the stream of history in the period 1914–18, we tried to escape it and return to our isolationist past. We wanted to be in the world but not of it. We overlooked the fact that our power was so great that by its mere existence, we tremendously influenced the world. We did not want to lead. Neither did we want to follow.

During the days of isolationism, we rejected the advice and counsel of that great scholar-statesman, Woodrow Wilson, and rejected the League of Nations. When the Senate of the United States rejected the League of Nations, Wilson cried out in his anguish and said that within a quarter of a century the world would be shocked and torn by another and more destructive war. His prediction came tragically true.

We found out that we could no longer wrap two oceans around us and be safe or secure. It is better to have security and not need it, than to need it and not have it.

We also found that this giant of the West, the United States of America, if civilization were to survive, must do a man's part in the world's great work. We cannot stand alone. We and other democracies of the earth, yes, civilization itself, stand in the most terrible danger that has faced the world in 2,000 years.

Many of our people were again isolationist. In August 1941—only a few months before Pearl Harbor—the House of Representatives extended the Selective Service Act by a margin of only one vote. If we had not extended selective service, we would have been taking down our Army instead of having it and building it up when we were attacked at Pearl Harbor.

I am glad to say that West Virginia has never been subject to the blindness of isolationism. Its people have always known that we could not be in the world and at the same time not of it.

A moment ago I said that we have done well in international affairs. Let me explain. We who have only recently come into the stream of history are now the leaders of the free world. It is primarily our strength, however indispensible our allies may be to us, that prevents Russian communism from enslaving the world. It is we who, through the Marshall plan, kept Western Europe from falling prey to communism after the end of the last war.

It is we, who, by accepting the heavy responsibility of Korea, have kept communism from engulfing southeast Asia. It is we who, through various military and diplomatic moves, held back the enemy in Italy, Greece, and other points throughout the world. If it is not surprising that we have made mistakes, it is surprising that we made so few and emerged so quickly from our historical isolationism. For nations tend to move slowly in great matters, sometimes taking generations to change over from the past. Yet we have moved with a speed that must seem bewildering to our enemies.

This is a creditable performance, but it must not lull us into complacence, for to be complacent in our world is to court national catastrophe. We live, and we shall continue to live through the foreseeable future, in great peril. We still have much to do. No people can beat us in a short-distance run. But our enemy is a plodder, and he will not run our kind of race.

So, too, the Russian aim to dominate the world is not new. You will find, if you look into it, that Russian writers and thinkers have long held that it is Russia's mission to dominate the world, believing as the Germans believed a little while ago, that they are superior to all other peoples. In this respect the czar and the commissar are one.

We must understand something of the nature of the enemy if we are to stand firm against him. One part of his nature is that he is infinitely patient as he is infinitely crafty.

As a people we like to tackle a job, do it, and go on to the next job. It does not make sense in international affairs.

So it was that, once the war was over in 1945, we did not even stop to bring about an orderly demobilization of the mightiest fighting force the world has ever seen. On the contrary, as General Marshall reported to the Nation, we hysterically disbanded it.

Some people have said that Western Europe expects us to fight its battles for it. This absurd charge is demonstrably false. The population of Western Europe is just about twice our population. They, therefore, must and will supply most of the troops, although we may have to supply most of the arms. But—and this is the point—the deadly seriousness of Western Europe's intentions is proved by the fact that they ask us to send American troops at all. By so doing, they demonstrate two things. The first is that they do not intend to appease Russia, for the presence of our troops in Western Europe is notice of determined resistance to communism instead of appeasement. Second—and most important—by asking us to send troops, Europeans are inviting us to make their towns and cities and homes and countryside the primary battleground of the war if it should come.

I don't think that anyone here is foolish enough to ask if these allies are worthwhile. The population of Western Europe, I repeat, is twice our own and considerably more than that of Russia proper. Its gifted people contain thousands of scientists and technicians of the highest skill. Let us remember that we have no monopoly of brains, ideals, or love of freedom. They have a workshop second only to ours. They belong to our common western civilization; their religious and political faiths are akin to our own. They are, in short, indispensable to us as we are indispensable to them.

Naturally they don't always see eye-to-eye with us about everything, and we must not expect that.

The hallmark of being adult is that a man understands he must pay a price for everything he wants. Once he understands this, he is at peace with himself and the world. No price is too high to pay for freedom. Who can put a dollar mark on the life of a single American lost in battle? What price did our forefathers pay so that they might bequeath this great country to us? What price, then, are we willing to pay so that we may pass it on, great and free. A high standard of living is a desirable thing. But more desirable—and more enduring—is a high standard of life.

You young people who are being graduated here today will shortly for the first time, so to speak, go out into life. Its primary condition is struggle. It is also a great challenge and a great opportunity to live in a land that is so free that every man, woman, and child can do what he or she wants to do, say what they want to say, write what they want to write, so long as in the doing of these things they do not deprive others of exercising the same rights and prerogatives and the same privileges. You are free to choose your own course.

You know from your studies that many groups of men and many species of animals, birds, and plants, have disappeared from the earth because they could not adapt themselves to changing circumstances. This Nation, as I said before, has only recently gone out into life as it came for the first time into the turbulent stream of history. It, too, must understand that the first law of life is struggle; the second, the necessity to adapt itself to changing circumstances.

We have been an immensely fortunate people, and I do not think that we have been unworthy of our gifts. The incidents of geography and space and the fact that others kept the peace of the world so long enabled us to grow and spread and become in time the world's mightiest power.

Founding this country in freedom, and dedicating it to freedom, we have subscribed, and continue to subscribe, to the highest ideals of western civilization. Now this civilization is in imminent peril as it faces a very real threat to its existence at the hands of ruthless totalitarians.

The threat comes at a time when we are the world's mightiest power. Far from bewailing our fate, therefore, I think we should regard it as a high privilege that we have become the great defender of the faith; the best hope on earth. I have no doubt, God willing, that we shall prevail.

A Helping Hand for the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, I introduced a bill to provide that Federal funds be provided to construct outright any new school facilities required by school districts which are carrying out, or are prepared to carry out, integration programs. This bill has received generous and favorable attention from many sources and I have been encouraged by the response.

However, I have found that some have not fully understood the spirit in which my proposal was conceived. Illustrative of such a lack of understanding is an editorial which appeared on June 16 in the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch. I believe that my colleagues will find this editorial and the letter reply which I wrote to Mr. Virginius Dabney, the editor of the Times-Dispatch, most informative. An editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of the same day reveals a quite different reaction from another newspaper published in a State which is also confronted with this problem. In the interest of clarification, I present herewith the two editorials and my letter to the Richmond paper:

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of June 16, 1955]

SILLY PLAN TO AID INTEGRATION

Illustrative of the profound and widespread misunderstanding in other sections

of the issues involved in the South's segregation problem is the action of Representative UDALL, of Arizona, in introducing a bill in Congress providing for Federal appropriations of up to $150 million a year to build whatever new buildings are required to integrate pupils in the public schools.

Strange as it must appear to Mr. UDALL, the immensely difficult problems posed by the Supreme Court's recent ruling with respect to integration in the public schools are not primarily, or even secondarily, financial. They are mainly social and racial.

As a matter of fact, it has been argued by advocates of integration that a great deal of public money would be saved if the races were mixed in the schools. Actually, the saving would be much less than some of these persons claim, but there probably would be a certain amount of saving, at least at the outset.

Yet if the number of children in the schools were to remain about the same as before integration, there could not be any great difference in the number of school buildings, schoolrooms and schoolteachers required. As the school population mounted—which it is now doing more rapidly than in earlier years—the physical facilities and the teaching staffs would have to go up with it. This increase in staff and facilities will have to take place anyway, if the schools are to keep pace with mounting enrollments in the coming years.

True, there is the possibility that some such plan as separate schools for the two sexes might be adopted as one way of meeting the Court's integration order. There is also the proposal that 3 types of schools be maintained at each level—1 for white, 1 for colored, and 1 for members of both races who wish to attend a mixed school. Either of these plans would cost more than the system we now have.

But Representative UDALL is a wholesouled integrationist who wants to accelerate the process of mixing the races. When he introduced the bill for Federal aid, he was not thinking of financing expensive ways of reducing or avoiding the impact of integration.

It is impossible, therefore, to take him seriously. The Federal appropriations he proposes are not needed, even if the South were planning to integrate speedily—which it isn't.

Aside from everything else, Federal appropriations for schools are basically bad. They give the Federal Government a voice in the management of the schools, and they increase the already vastly excessive dependence of the States and localities on Washington. The sooner the Udall bill is forgotten the better.

JUNE 21, 1955.

Mr. VIRGINIUS DABNEY,
Editor, Richmond Times-Dispatch,
Richmond, Va.

DEAR SIR: I have read with interest your editorial of June 16, 1955, entitled "Silly Plan To Aid Integration." Since you have chosen to describe my bill to assist school districts which are carrying out, or are prepared to carry out, a program of integration as illustrative of the profound and widespread misunderstanding on other sections of the issues involved in the South's segregation problem, I feel impelled to call certain facts to your attention.

Your editorial asserts: "Strange as it must appear to Mr. UDALL, the immensely difficult problems posed by the Supreme Court's recent ruling with respect to integration in the public schools are not primarily, or even secondarily, financial. They are mainly social and racial." This statement does not appear strange to me; in fact, I expressed a similar belief when I introduced the bill, for I said:

"Without doubt, the main impediment to integration is the delicate and extremely complex human relations questions which are implicit in the Court's decision. This paramount problem is, of course, a local matter which must be worked out by the communities and individuals directly affected. It cannot be solved overnight by rulings of courts or by laws enacted in legislative bodies. Men of good will in these communities must wrestle with this problem and solve it as best they can, for admittedly any outside pressure or intrusion would only aggravate the situation."

I cannot agree with your statement that the financial effect of a program of integration probably would be a certain amount of saving, at least at the outset. Certainly, the people of the South have no inclination to lower the standard of education for any child as a result of integration. On the basis of findings by the Office of Education in its survey of school facilities throughout the country, it is indisputable that the South does face an excessive and unfair financial burden. Since I feel that this burden is partially a result of Federal action—the rulings of the Supreme Court—I have suggested that the Federal Government has a responsibility to assist in these terms: "This national obligation is emphasized, too, by the fact that under dual school systems many of the schools for Negro children have been markedly substandard. If we are really interested, then, in successfully implementing the Court's decision, we should guard against any program which would result in a leveling down of our schools. It is obvious that only under a substantial Federal-aid program such as I have outlined can we insure that the standard of the whole system will be raised, and thus protect the integrity of our educational enterprise."

The intention of my bill I described in these words:

"At the very least, such funds would help the areas concerned, begin the job which must be done. Most important, it would be warmhearted testimony to school districts facing this problem that the entire country is sympathetically interested and is willing to assist in the task ahead. No longer would the affected areas be justified in feeling that they are confronted by a Federal club, and are being ordered to integrate. Rather, they would realize that we all share their concern, and are prepared to help. Instead of self-righteous criticism, the rest of the country would hold out a helping hand; instead of threats, we would use understanding; in place of compulsion, we would offer cooperation."

If this qualifies as "silly" language, I plead guilty to your charge.

Inasmuch as I come from a State which has faced a similar integration problem in the recent past, I was somewhat distressed by your cavalier dismissal of my purposes. My own State in 1952 and 1953 faced and overcame problems no less serious than those which confront many Virginia communities today. As a school board member, I am thoroughly familiar with all of these attendant difficulties.

I am enclosing a copy of the statement which I made in the House of Representatives when I introduced the bill. I believe you will find when you read it that I have advanced a constructive proposal which deserves to be examined on its merits.

Sincerely,

STEWART L. UDALL.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 16, 1955]

AID FOR INTEGRATION

An Arizona Congressman has faced up to one of the real problems of ending racial segregation in the schools by proposing Federal aid during the transition.

Representative STEWART UDALL makes a persuasive case when he says that, just as the Federal Government grants funds for school construction where its defense projects create an impact on local facilities, so local districts which are put under a strain by the Supreme Court's mandate are entitled to claim some help in meeting extraordinary expenses that result.

In most States where segregation has been the rule, the myth of "separate but equal" has been exploded long since. Where separate schools fell short of equality, integrated schools cannot be brought up to equality without an increase in expenditures. That is what many southern districts will face, and there are reasons both of justice and expediency for Federal aid at least in limited areas, such as the construction of needed new schools, and raising the standards of teacher salaries.

Federal aid to education in the broader sense has been blockaded all too long by an unfortunate controversy over extending that aid to private church schools as well as public schools. There is no good reason why this controversy should enter into the consideration of the Udall bill. As the Supreme Court's opinion applied only to public schools, so by definition only public schools could be eligible for Federal aid in complying with it. Congress should lend a sympathetic ear to the proposal.

Duty of Christian Politician

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, recently the National Council of Catholic Men began a series of radio addresses on current topics. The first speaker in the series was our colleague from Minnesota, Hon. EUGENE J. MCCARTHY. The Congressman's remarks were timely and significant, and might well serve as a guide to those of us who must make decisions for our Nation in these critical times. I should like to quote here some excerpts from Congressman MCCARTHY'S talk, taken from an article in a recent issue of the Milwaukee Catholic Herald Citizen:

DUTY OF CHRISTIAN POLITICIAN CLEAR—MUST BE GUIDED BY MORAL LAW, SAYS SOLON IN CATHOLIC HOUR TALK

NEW YORK.—"The Christian politician must hold fast to the moral law," Representative EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, declared Sunday in the first of a new series of radio addresses on current topics sponsored by the National Council of Catholic Men and featured on the Catholic Hour carried by the National Broadcasting Co. "In the course of history," he said, "we have learned something of the great danger in rendering to religion the things that are Caesar's, namely, political authority and political power, and of the danger of rendering to Caesar the things that are God's—faith, worship, and absolute obedience."

The legislator, who formerly taught sociology at St. Thomas College in St. Paul, declared that the power of the absolute state has been forcefully demonstrated and constitutes a lesson that should not soon be forgotten.

"We must at all times be alert to the danger of intrusion by the state into areas of culture and into areas in the social and private life of man which are beyond the

authority of the state. In our alertness and vigilance, however, we should not be led to accept unsound theories concerning the origin, nature, functions, and purposes of the state. What is called for is careful examination, distinction, and reordination."

McCARTHY said that while the state has the right to suppress certain moral teachings, such as forbidding the practice of bigamy by certain religious sects, it has no right to deny or interfere with man in his effort to attain moral perfection. On the contrary, he added, the state has the obligation to assist man in achieving this goal.

He reminded that recognition of Christianity by a state does not make that state Christian. He said that the calling of a Christian is not to judge the world, but rather to save it, and in approaching politics the Christian must be realistic since politics is part of the real world.

"The Christian in politics should be judged by the standards of whether through his decisions and actions he has advanced the cause of justice and helped, at least, to achieve the highest degree of perfection possible in the temporal order," McCARTHY said.

He pointed out that when a political problem can be reduced to the simple question of feeding the hungry or not feeding them, ransoming or refusing to ransom the captive, of harboring the harborless or leaving him homeless, there should be no uncertainty as to the Christian position.

But, McCARTHY reminded, problems of overpopulation, of displaced and expelled persons, of political refugees and the like are in reality not always reducible to simple choices. He added: "As a general rule the inclination of the Christian should be to liberality.

"His mistakes and failures on problems of this kind should be as a consequence of leniency rather than of a fearful self-interest; of excess of trust, rather than of excess of doubt and anxiety."

The Christian politician, McCARTHY said, "must, of course, hold fast to the moral law, remembering that the precepts of morality do not themselves change, even though the way in which they are applied to concrete acts may be modified as society regresses or is perverted." He said the Christian in politics should be distinguished by his alertness to protect the rights of individuals, of religious and other institutions from violations by the state or individuals.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 21, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, June 20, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Dr. Herbert E. Richards, First Methodist Church, Boise, Idaho, offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, as little children we press our ears against the doors of the future, listening for Thy return. In this hallowed place of government may we hear Thy fatherly admonitions of hope for the hopeless, comfort for the discouraged, courage for our leaders.

Grant our people a sense of unity amidst diversity, a sense of crusading achievement in a world of doubt. Help mankind, we pray, to conquer greed, that peace may come through peace in the human heart.

Inspire our Nation's officials to confidence born of faith, against which the gates of hell cannot prevail.

In the name of the God of our fathers. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., June 21, 1955.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BARKLEY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On the request of Mr. SMATHERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 20, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 35) to permit the transportation in the mails of live scorpions, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1464) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain rights-of-way and timber access roads, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 692. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for Peace";

H. R. 2972. An act to require the recordation of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights;

H. R. 4001. An act to provide for the management and disposition of certain public domain lands in the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 4585. An act to amend the act of August 24, 1912, to simplify the procedures governing the mailings of certain publications of churches and church organizations;

H. R. 4747. An act to provide that reversionary interests of the United States in certain lands formerly conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., shall be quitclaimed to such city;

H. R. 4802. An act to authorize the execution of mortgages and deeds of trust on individual Indian trust or restricted land;

H. R. 4808. An act to authorize the transmission through the mails of certain keys, identification devices, and small articles, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4915. An act to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen;

H. R. 5652. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army and Air Force, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5891. An act to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6295. An act to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 109) authorizing the appointment of a congressional delegation to attend the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H. R. 1062. An act for the relief of Luigi Cianci;

H. R. 1081. An act for the relief of Anna Tokatlian Gulezian;

H. R. 1086. An act for the relief of Mayer Rothbaum;

H. R. 1108. An act for the relief of Rose Mazur;

H. R. 1165. An act for the relief of Maria Theresia Reinhardt and her child, Maria Anastasia Reinhardt; and

S. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution dedicating the Lee Mansion in Arlington National Cemetery as a permanent memorial to Robert E. Lee.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 692. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for Peace";

H. R. 4585. An act to amend the act of August 24, 1912, to simplify the procedures governing the mailings of certain publications of churches and church organizations; and

H. R. 4808. An act to authorize the transmission through the mails of certain keys, identification devices, and small articles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2972. An act to require the recordation of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights;